

64

A COPY
OF
SOME PAPERS
PAST AT
OXFORD,
BETWIXT

The Author of the Practicall Catechisme,
AND
Mr. Ch.

The second Edition.

Henry

Hammond

Χρήστος τοῖς διαβολαῖς μὴ ἀποσιωπᾶν, ἵνα μὴ συγχωρή-
σωμεν εὐδοκῆσαι τῇ ψεύδει, καὶ τοὺς ἠπατημένους μὴ ἐναφωμῆς
τῇ βλάβῃ, St. Basil. Epist. 63.

LONDON,

Printed by J. A. Fleisher for Richard Royston at the
Angel in Ivie-lane, 1650.

12.3
X 14.8
130.8
9M

1901

1902

1903

1904

1905

1906

1907

1908

1909

1910

1911

1912

1913

1914



For M^r Cheynell.

S I R,

AT my returne from *London* late last night, I met with some scattered reports of your dealing with the Author of the *Practicall Catechisme*, in a late Sermon or Sermons of yours in this City; within a few dayes after, I met you at Col. *Hammonds* lodgings, and signified my intentions to goe out of Towne the next day. Now though the care I have of the reputation of that Author be not so great or passionate, as to put me upon the least thought or designe of working any proportionable revenge on him, that endeavoured publicly to defame him; or to make you any return, save onely of my prayers to God for you, that he will forgive you all the trespasses that either this, or any other dealing of yours hath been guilty of, and that he will give you a right Judgement in all things; yet because I would not be in danger to beleieve any thing of you causlessly, I thought my selfe obliged in Justice to you, to desire from you (who know best what you said) an exact account in writing (as farre as your memory will serve) of all that you said in publike, either at St. *Maries*, or *Carfax*, wherein the Author of that Catechisme was concerned. I do much abuse my selfe in the notion I have of Christian Justice, if that doe not oblige you to answer this request of

Octob. 10. 1646.

Your Servant

H. Hammond.

I shall re-inforce my request, that you will send me the summe of what you said, with as little alteration as is possible.

A 2

Sir,

S I R,

I Returne you thanks, and am before-hand with you for Prayers, the Lord pardon, and lead you into all truth and holinesse. Truly Sir, I had said as much of the *Practicall Catechisme* as I did say, though you had beene in Towne, nay, had beene (where you might learne something of my brethren) at Church. What I said of the Author of that Catechisme, was (your Friends being Judges) as much as hee deserved: some thinke I spoke too highly in his commendat ons: But to the point; first you say you are obliged in Justice to mee to desire an exact account of my Sermons: Sure this is somewhat more then equall Justice to mee, it is to exercise Jurisdiction over mee. Secondly, you doe much abuse your selfe in the notion of Christian justice, if you conceive mee obliged in Christian justice to give you an account this night (being to preach to morrow) of what I preached about ten dayes agoe.

I will deale plainly with you, I have not said all that I intend to say of that Catechisme, because it seemes to evacuate the morall Law, under pretence of filling up its vacuities, and it doth in effect overthrow the sum and substance of the Gospel. Sir, this is more then I said in either Sermon; But you shall (in due time, place, and manner, as soone as my weighty occasions will permit) receive the reasons of this assertion

From your humble Servant

Fr. Cheynell.

*Saturday, Octob. 10. 1646.
about 4 of the clock in the after-
noone.*

Sir,

What I said of the *Practicall Catechisme*.

S I R,

SIR,

I Am sorry I was so mistaken in you, as to make a request to which you doe not by your answer returne me one word: nor are so favourable as to promise me any at your greater leasure. Having had this experience of you, I shall make no more new questions (to which the former part of your Letter might tempt one that were curious) as who of my Friends they were, which were so well satisfied with what you said of the Author of that Catechisme; or, wh^o againe, that envied him the elogy which you affirme your selfe to have bestowed upon him. I shall rather take occasion from these two affirmations of yours, to inforce my one former Petition, that you will commit to paper what you said, and give me leave to passe a judgment whether the Author be obliged to thanke you for civilities, or (as my present intelligence goes) to clear himself from your accusations I am willing to flatter my self by the second leaf of your Letter (begun with a Sir, what I said of the practicall Catechisme] and so abruptly broke off) that you were once in so good humour, as to designe me the favour I petition'd for; and if I am deceived, yet have I now more reason to importune it; because, first, by your present mistaking of my few Lines : and secondly, returning an answer very distant from the particular propoed by mee; I am enclined to beleeye it possible that your exceptions to the Author of the Catechisme might be mistakes also, (and then I would hope I might rectifie, and you retract those mistakes;) Or else, secondly, that your answers might be somewhat from the matter, and the shewing you that might to you be usefull also. And if neither of these should prove true, I shall farther invite you to that charity by a serious promise, that whatever you to my apprehension justly object against, or confute in that Author, shall by Gods grace tend to my edification. And having that preparation of mind, I hope your prayer will be heard, that God will pardon, and lead me into all truth and holinesse. That you may not thinke I have beene unjust in mentioning such blemishes in your Letter (and that I may performe to you, what I desire of you) I shall first mention the mistakes in it. The first is, your interpreting my desire to you for an exercise of Jurisdiction over you, which that it may appeare probable, you say, I desire an exact account of your Ser-

A Copy of some Papers

mons. Where first, Sir, to desire an account, is not to exercise jurisdiction: Secondly, the account I desired, was not of your Sermons, or of any part of them, saving onely of that wherein the Author of the Catechisme was concerned, and that I then told you I was obliged (in Justice to you) to desire, and I still conceive I am so, it being but just, to use this obvious conducing meanes to keep me from beleeving you to have said any thing but what you did say, when perhaps the relations of others may bee unjust to you, (and tempt mee to be so also) and no body can well assure mee of either, but your selfe. What you meane by [*more then an equall justice to you*] I shall not demand, because I would make haste to conclude this paper: yet because I suppose you would intimate by that phrase, that it was not Justice to you (for if it were more then equall on your side, you would not complaine; and besides you say, it is exercising jurisdiction over you, which for mee to doe over you, were I confesse injustice) I must further evidence it were not, by naming you the particulars which are reported to mee from your Sermon, which are such false suggestions, that nothing but your saying, and saying truly that you sayd them not, can cleare you from a great fault, of which that I may not charge you untruly, I had no sure way, but to make that request to you. The particulars are four:

First, That you told your Auditory that there was a Catechisme, and never a word of the Trinity in it. Of this I desire you to informe mee whether you said it or no. For if you did, there was great injustice in it. For 1. if you had mentioned the full title of the Book, not a Catechisme (to which it may seeme proper to treat of the Trinity) but a Catechisme with a restriction to one kind of matter, a Practicall Catechisme, there had then been no great matter of wonder or complaint, that that speculative mysterie had not been handled.

But then 2, the very first lines of that Booke would farther have prevented that objection. For the Scholar there professing himselfe to have attained in some measure to the understanding of the principles of Religion proposed by our Church Catechisme (and that by this very Catechists care, who had often done it in his Parish, and at this time chose to doe somewhat else) and the beliefe of the Trinity being part of that Catechisme, and of those instructions, there is a cleare reason why
in

in the subsequent discourse the Doctrine of the Trinity is not handled, because it is supposed as a *præcognitum* before it.

3 This speech if it were yours, would seeme to have some designe in it, and (whether meant by you, or not) be thought by others to affix on the Author either denying of the Trinity, or being guilty of some error in that point, which he was willing to conceal: and that this Author is guilty of neither, I beleeve any man will be convinced by that Catechisme, *viz.* in the last lines of it, where there is expresse mention of, and prayer directed to the blessed Trinity coeternall, to which one infinite Majesty, &c. In which few words are disclaimed (though not confuted) as many of the errors of the *Antitrinitarian* and *Socinian* as could be well expected in that matter, I mean the words Trinity, and Unity, eternity of each Person, and coeternity.

The second thing that I heard of, was in the matter of Oaths, that the Catechisme had trained up youth very ill, in giving license to vaine Oaths, which you are said to have concluded from these words in the Catechisme, where in answer to this question, Is the third Commandement in *Exod.* [Thou shalt not take the name of God in vaine] no more then Thou shalt not forswear thy selfe? It is answered, No more undoubtedly — for there, I am told, you stopt, and from thence fell into some expressions against the Doctrine and Booke. If this were so, then were you very unjust to your Auditory, in withholding from them the consequences, which would certainly have kept them in charity with the Author. I beseech you, Sir, read on, and you shall finde that there is there as severe an interdiction of all kinde of swearing in a Christian (and sure such are all to whom this Catechisme was meant) as can bee imagined: in plaine words, *a totall universall prohibition of swearing is selfe, making that as unlawfull now, as perjury was before, and a great deale more, so extremely strict, that I have by learned men been asked whether that Author were not too severe against all kinde of swearing, but (I thanke God) never heard it fancied, that there was any ground or appearance of liberty to bee drawne thence. All that that Author can differ from you in, is his opinion, that the words of the third Commandement belong expressly to perjury onely; and for that opinion hee brings the plaine words of Christ, which reads it *sed iniquissimum, whom shalt not forswear, &c.**

Secondly,

Secondly, the importance of the word in the originall, where to lift up (or take) the name of God, signifies to sweare, and [*vainely*] signifies [*falsely*,] and so the very word used in *Exod.* and there rendred [*vaine*] is *Deut.* 5. in the ninth commandment rendered [*false*.] To these Arguments, if you can give a satisfactory answer, he may chance to change his opinion in that. But however, the insisting on Christs direct punctuall prohibition will sure prove it a sufficient calumny in him that shall hence conclude the Author to have given youth any liberty in this kind. I would no man were more guilty of vaine Oaths, in himself or others, then that Catechist is, and resolves to bee. Having said thus much, I shall adde *ex abundanti*, that in kinnesse and submission to the meanest, the Author thought fit to adde in a last edition (intended above a yeare since, but sold in this Towne above a month agoe) after these words [no more undoubtedly] these words, by way of explication of what before hee meant. [In the primary intention of the phrase] for to that onely hee professes to have designed that speech, never thinking to deny or doubt, but that vaine Oaths (though not swearing simply taken *i. e.* all kinde of swearing) would there bee forbidden also though not primarily, yet by way of reduction; which you may guesse to have been his meaning, because hee adds, that perhaps foolish, wanton using of Gods name (though not in oaths, for one may use Gods name and not sweare) surely profane using of it, is forbidden by that reduction. And (I pray) doe you guesse whether it be likely that hee which said, perhaps foolish using of Gods name was in the law forbidden, and all kinde of voluntary swearing under the Gospel, could justly bee charged as a friend to your g men, in giving them any of that liberty. If you can thinke it possible, yet read on to the end of that matter, and I will be bound you shall thinke otherwise.

Your next exception (I am told) was, that in the matter of repentance, the Author makes inclination to sinne an infelicity, not a sinne. Th's, if you said, you are much to blame. For in the place whereto that refers, 'tis cleare that under the generall words, of [All kinds and sorts of sinnes] the first kinde named is weaknesse, frailties, pollutions of our natures, our pronenesse and inclination to sinne. Which being positively said, would, in the judgement of any ingenuous man have helped to interpret that which

which follows [as infelicities, if not as finnes] thus not to deny them to bee finnes, within two lines after it had been affirmed they were, but that even in their opinion that tooke them to be onely infelicities, not finnes, (as sure some doe, when they are not consented to) they were yet to bee to them matter of humiliation, true sorrow and grieve, as the words are cleare, no where so much as intimating that they are not finnes; unlesse when hee saith they are no actuall finnes, which I hope you wil not say they are, when not consented to.

Your next exception, (I am told) was about justification, but my relations differ in the particular. Some say your quarrell was, that hee makes faith a condition, no instrument. If that were it, I pray tell me whether you thinke faith a physicall instrument of justification, (as for a morall instrument, that he in termes acknowledges) or when justification is onely an act of Gods through Christ pardoning of sin, and accounting just, you can imagine that faith hath any kinde of reall though instrumentall efficiency in that worke, i. e. whether faith in any such sense can pardon sin, or pronounce just, or whether it bee not sufficient to acknowledge it an instrument in receiving of Christ, and all other acts of the man as Christian, and onely a condition or capacity in the subject to make capable of Gods act upon him in justification? this is the sum of what the Author saith in that point, and shal be farther cleared to you, if that were your exception. Others tell mee it was concerning the priority of sanctification, before justification. Which point, as it is there stated, can bee no matter of quarrell to any that affirms the receiving of Christ to bee pre-required to justification. For as that is no more then that faith is pre-required (in the true notion of faith, and that wherein Dr. *Preston* acknowledges it) so is it by that Author said, that onely that sanctification is precedent to justification, which is the cordiall assent to Christs commands and promises, giving up the heart to him, resolution of obedience; not the actuall performance and practice of those vows, for that is acknowledged there to bee after justification. These are the particulars I have heard of, and have now reason to beleieve, that of all them you are not guilty, especially of the first, though 'twas (even at *London*) positively told mee from you. And therefore I doe by these presents acquit you of that, but yet thinke it not amisse to have

mentioned that report, that by it you may see (what alone I have now in hand to prove) how truly I told you, that to avoid the danger of beleevving any thing of you causlessly, I thought my self obliged in justice to you, to beg an exact account of what you said. I have been too long on the evidencing your first mistake, I would you had answered my request, and then you had taken away all excuse of that prolixity.

Your second mistake was, that you conceived mee to have said that 'twas a piece of Christian justice in you to have given mee an account this night, &c. wherein you were faine to adde to my words [*this night*] whereas I onely mentioned an answer, but assigned you no time for it, but punctually required the Messenger to desire to know, when it would bee seasonable, and hee should call for it; and accordingly, though I have this evening written this rejoinder, yet that I may not trouble you, I meane to respite the sending it till Munday. And yet by the way, I conceive it had been as easie for you to have given mee what I desired, as that Letter in stead of it, unlesse it be easier for you to write out of your invention then your memory. I am sure it had been the savingst way, for then you had escaped this importunity. The distance of your answer from my proposition I shall not need to put you in minde of. That which you meane to adde more of the Catechisme, is not all, nor (if my intelligence faile me not) any part of what you have said already: and 'tis but diversion to tell mee you will say more, and give mee reason of that more, when as yet much lesse is desired of you, and cannot bee obtained. I shall when you are at leisure, desire all your heape of exceptions against that poore creature, that (I will bee depofed for it) meant no man any greater malice, then to land him safe at heaven the nearest and furest way that the Author could imagin. But I will not yet importune you for any more then you have yet delivered publikely in this City. By granting me this uprightly and candidly, you will make me really rejoyce to hear that you shall have taken any further notice of me; but if you shall persist to deny me this first request, you will utterly discourage

Your Servant

Octob. 20. 1646.

H. Hammond.

Postscript.

POSTSCRIPT.

YOU are pleased to mention your designe of further severity against that Authour in the matter of the morall law, which (say you) it seemes to evacuate under pretence of filling up its vacuities; and adde, that it doth in effect overthrow the summe and substance of the Gospel. The latter of these (I confesse) would be a little strange to me, that he that labours to elevate the Gospel-precepts (as you think, too much) above the Law, should overthrow the summe or substance of the Gospel. I must professe to beleeve that whatever charge can be affixt to that Doctrine, that would not bee it, but rather that it labours to raise the Gospel to a greater height then it would bear, or indeed to lessen the Law, not to alter any thing in the Gospel. In this particular I must professe my self posed, and utterly unable to conjecture what you mean, till you are so kind as to adde your reasons. One thing onely I meant to serve you in by this Postscript (because I see that, unlesse others have deceived mee, you may possibly bee deceived in passing judgement on that Book) and that is, to tell you, that you have a hard task to prove that that Authour doth at all evacuate the Law morall (unlesse you guard your selfe by that cautious word, that *it seemes* to evacuate it, and that it may, and not doe it really.) For you may please to marke from mee, (who know the sense and spirit of that Author better then you) that hee saith not positively that Christ added to the Law new precepts, but one of these two, either new precepts, or new light; and concludes that either of these two will serve his turne, and enhance the Christians obligation; and addes, that hee that will acknowledge that Christ requires more of his Disciples or Christians now, then the Jewes by any cleare revelation had been convinced to be necessary before, did grant as much in effect as he desired to be granted. And yet farther, in the close, that if any will contend, and shew as universall plain obliging precepts under the Law, as there are in the fifth of St. *Matthew*, he shall bee glad to see them, and not contend with him, so that hee will bring the Jewes up to us, and not us downe to the Jewes; professing that the onely danger which hee had used all his diligence to prevent. Now

A Copy of some Papers

I have told you this, use your discretion, and let mee heare the worst you can say in this particular also.

For Dr. Hammond.

SIR,

I Was not the first, no nor the last, that endeavoured to confute the dangerous errors of your much admired Catechisme, yet I doe not hear that you have fallen foule upon any but on my selfe. I acknowledge my selfe the weakest, and yet am confident that Gods power will bee manifested in my weaknesse, that God may have all the glory. I received your Rejoynder upon Munday: that day I was forced to goe out of Town to speake with a Gentleman; I was to preach yesterday morning, and to performe some exercise in the afternoon for the satisfaction of some that are much seduced, this Friday morning I return you what I can, and hope it will give you some satisfaction.

Sir, your messenger forgot your charge, and never told mee that you expected an answer when I was, at leasure, and therefore I scribbled somewhat in haste, as now I doe, for I have not one houre in a day free from disturbance.

Your errors were more solidly refuted by two of my Reverend Brethren, that are both of them Seniors to you: they would have been able to have given you better satisfaction.

Your desire to know what I said at *Carfax*. I tooke notice of that passage page 243. of your last edition, where you speake to this effect [That the holy Ghost was our advocate in settling a Ministry to pray and intercede for their severall Congregations (and enabling them in the very Apostles time to forme a Liturgy to continue in the Church to that end) and thereby helping our infirmities, and teaching us to pray as wee ought.] I said, I should bee glad to see that Liturgy which you say was then formed; And 2 was to bee continued in the Church. 3 To know whether the Holy Ghost doth help our infirmities by any other Liturgy or not. 4 Whether they doe not pray as they ought, who know not where to procure that very Liturgy, which you say was formed in the Apostles times, and to bee continued in the Church. 5 Whether

ther the Common-prayer-book be that very Liturgy.

Sir, Mr. Reynolds told mee you wanted direction about your first fruits, if your brother will procure L. Gen. Cromwell to speak to Sir H. Vane junior, it is in his power to relieve you. Forgive the abruptnesse of

Your faithfull Servant

Francis Cheynell

In this outer Paper was inclosed as follows.

SIR,

I Was not much taken with your notion of Justice; but I shall I gratifie your desire, being now invited to charity by your serious promise and preparation of minde to entertaine the truth, if God be pleased to discover it to you by so weake an instrument as I confesse my selfe to bee. You have changed and mollified your phrase; you did not stoope so low in your Letter, as you doe in your Rejoynder (as you are pleased to terme it) to beg an account. Truly Sir, I did stumble at those hard words, exact account, considering that you have exercised jurisdiction heretofore in a Countrey, where I am now seated by the Parliament. You complaine of false suggestions, I pray God forgive them that suggested so many false accusations against mee to you, who have (as I perceive) more worth in you, then to beleeve them.

1. It is reported that I complained of you to my Auditory, because you did not handle the Trinity in your Catechisme, nay, that there was not a word of the Trinity in that Catechisme: I beleeve Mr. Digle will bee so candid, as to assure you that this is a false suggestion. But give me leave, Doctor, to deale plainly with you, there is an accusation framed against you by your owne Apology, for you speake in the language of you know whom, when you tell mee, that I need not wonder if the speculative mystery of the Trinity bee not handled in a Practicall Catechisme. Beleeve it, the Doctrine of the Trinity is a Practicall

mystery, the very foundation and ground-worke of the mystery of godlinesse. The blessed Trinity is not onely the object of our faith, but of our Worship too; nay, the Doctrine of the Trinity hath by Gods blessing a comfortable and quickning influence into the maine passages of the life and conversation of all Orthodox and judicious Christians. I hope, I need not remember you of your Baptisme, or tell you that a Sacramentall Covenant is Practicall. Sir, rectifie that mistake, and I will forgive the suggester.

Your next reason concerns the Church-Catechisme, I suppose you meane that Catechisme in the Common-prayer-book: now truly Sir, I must confesse that I like that Catechisme farre better then your Practicall Catechisme: and your Friends will tell you, that you might have contented your selfe with that Catechisme, unlesse you could have made a better.

To your third reason I answer, that I did once in *London* shew that passage, which you cite out of your prayer, to assure a friend of yours, that you did acknowledge the Trinity, though you maintaine many errors, broached by them that deny the coeternall Trinity in unity. I hasten to your second report.

2. Concerning your exposition of the third Commandement, I said, the youths, &c. had learnt the Art of swearing as perfect as their Catechisme; and added, that I did not wonder at it, when I read such a passage in a Practicall Catechisme printed at *Oxford*; as you may also read, if you begin at the eighth Section of the second Booke (I adde these words now, because I have sent home the *Oxford* edition, and cite it according to the last edition,) where the eloquent Author (to whom for parts, gifts, learning, I acknowledge my selfe farre inferiour) being desired by his Scholar to weed out the vice of swearing, lest it should take too deep root in young men, and get into fashion, doth assure his Scholar that after this Preface, Ye have heard, &c. the first part of the Precept, *Matth. 5. 33.* [Thou shalt not forswear thy selfe] is clearly the third Commandement: but the latter part [But shalt performe, &c.] is taken out of other places of the Law to explaine the meaning of the former, and to expresse it to bee (as literally it sounds) against perjury or non-performance of promissory oaths: where note, there's liberty enough for assertory oaths, for the third Commandement

is not meant of assertory oaths, as is plainly said afterwards. But lest the Scholar should thinke that this was not the *full meaning* of the Law sent by *Moses*, hee is prompted to put the question home, whether there *bee no more* meant in the third Commandement then [Thou shalt not forswear thy selfe?] The Catechist answers sadly and peremptorily [No more undoubtedly.] This is a flat deniall indeed, which requires full assurance of belief in the Scholar, as it doth note confidence in the Teacher, *no more*, and *undoubtedly* no more. I feare that the *doubtfull* [perhaps] and *imaginary superaddition* following (of which I may have faire opportunity to speake more hereafter) will not bee so effectually to restrain the Youths or Doctors from swearing, as the unquestionable command of God. I hope, this exposition of the third Commandement is not generally received in this Univerfity, and doubt not but some will be so ingenuous as to protest against it.

Sit, I have no more then this in my notes concerning that passage in your Catechisme, though I was sufficiently prepared by meditation to have discoursed at large upon that Argument: whether the clock struck, or what other diversion there was, I know not; I beleeve I said not much more, but whether I delivered more or lesse at that time, I am not able to give you an exact account, it was not a businesse worth a designe to passe over such excuses as you alledge for your selfe.

1 A totall universall prohibition of swearing it selfe, and

making it is as unlawfull now as perjury was before, is a doctrine which you cannot prove, unlesse you mince your totall and universall with so many qualifications, that at last you lose the totall in a cypher. You say, as *Smalcinus* and the rest doe, that I must not take an oath but for Gods glory and the publike good; now this is

Christus precepit tertium mandatum, nec in rebus veris nomen Domini invocare permittit, nisi tale quid a nobis exeat dei gloria. Vide Smalcium de Divinit. Christi, & Catechism. Rucovienf.

Non assumes nomen Domini dei tui gratis, frustra, temere, in ullum vanum, uti viri diffusissima eruditio nis passim. Mandatum prohibetur hoc in loco, quia mendacium est gratis dictum, vanumquid.

2 Concerning:

cerning our difference, it is this: you undertooke to prove that by the third Commandement, there was *no more means*, then that a man should not forswear himselfe. Can you conclude this out of all your premises in the Catechisme? your ingenuity would not permit you to frame such a conclusion, and therefore you

The last edition at London, pag. 110.

NW Aleph est loco He, littera radicalis; est proprie vanitas, tam verborum quam rerum; saepe adverbialiter sumitur pro scilicet, temere.

conclude that answer of yours which begins C. *No more undoubtedly, &c.* thus, [By all which it is cleare, that to take Gods name in vaine is to forswear ones selfe.] You doe not adde, [and no more] which was the point in question, between the Scholar and the Catechist, and therefore that should have been proved, and in the conclusion inferred. 3 You appeale to

Christ the best Judge. Christ saith; that whatsoever oath is unnecessarily taken (so you must say, as I have proved before) commeth of evill, *Matth. 5. 37.* ἐὰν τὸ ποινῆς ἴσιν, if you will, of the evill one, or of the Devill. Now Sir, did not the third Commandement forbid all evill; or all devilish oaths?

Omne mendacium est vanum, sed omne vanum non est mendacium.

NW expoint per Kinom & Hebel. R. Selomo, &c.

4 That the word is rendered [false] sometimes, I grant; that it is as properly, if not more properly, rendred [vaine] you cannot deny; and if you consult *Aben-Ezra, R. Selomo, &c.* they will assure you that wee are not to lift up or take the name of God vainely: I need not goe about to prove that the Jewes saw this truth as clearly as we doe, but I can prove that they saw and acknowledged it, and that is sufficient for mee to prove against your assertion.

ἐνὶ ματαίῳ. Lxx.

Vide Stegman, Photin.

5 Consult the *Septuagint*, and see how they render the word, *Exod. 20. 7. Dent. 5. 11.* 6 You know, that the primary and principall signification of the word is not [false] but [vaine,] and every man that hath looked into the Hebrew, gives you instances enough. 7 You know, that others tell you, that if the

Non assumes nomen Domini gratia sine frustra, ut si non iures in ejus nomine nisi ob necessitatem; etiam veritas non est juranda nisi ob necessitatem. Vide Pagnini thesaurum, cura Merceri editum, pag. 2186.

primary intention had beene to forbid forswearing, divers other words or phrases would have been used in all probability; such as the holy Ghost uses in other places; learned men are bold to name divers, but I am not so bold. I might say a great deale more, if I had a mind

to wrangle with you about the primary intention: but that is not the question between you and mee; onely, you have acknowledged in a manner that the edition of your booke printed at *Oxford*, had in the judgement of Learned men somewhat questionable

onable. You tell mee of the last edition of your Book at *London*. I answer, 1 That I saw one edition printed at *London*, and compared it with the *Oxford* edition; what difference there is between them, it is your part to shew. 2 As for that edition you talke of, sold in *Oxford* about a moneth agoe, that was a fortnight before I preached; truly I bought that edition also. You see I was at some cost and paines to know your minde. 3 I read this last edition, and saw no difference between that and the other in this point about the meaning of the third Commandement. 4 I asked others, and they told mee that there were some additions at the end of this last edition. I perused those additions, and then concluded that I might take it for granted that was your opinion which was to bee found in all three editions. 5 You now referre mee to that last edition, and tell mee that you have added somewhat to those words [No more undoubtedly] by way of explication; good Sir, say, Retraction. 6, I have looked over those additions once againe, with the best eyes I have, and finde nothing about the primary intention of the phrase; You say, you added it; and where should I looke for an addition, but amongst your additions? you see how hard it is to finde your explication. Your Printer and you may well make a confessing apology; for the additions to the 120 page, concern nothing but perjury or sacriledge. 7 I looked on, to see whether it was not inserted afterwards, till I came to the end of your additions, and there I found some alterations, your last reserve, which (I confesse) I did not peruse, before I preached: my reason was, because you call them [Lesse remarkable alterations] and therefore I thought very innocently, that you had onely corrected some literall mistakes; but contrary to my conjecture, I there finde not onely some alteration, but (what I besse God for) a direct recantation of sundry particulars, and I hope you will see cause to recant much more. I will continue my prayers for you, and doe what I can to help you to some new light to discern old spirituall rules which were given by God in the time of *Moses*. Sir, seriously consider the carriage of this businesse, and tell me whether your patience or mine hath been more exercised? Take another Commandement, the sixth if you please, will you say there is no more, undoubtedly no more meant by that, but the actuall taking away

the life of a man? no, you answer more fairely; *pag. 99.* and why then could you not have interpreted the third Comandement as clearely? 3 Consider that there are three editions of your Book abroad, every man will not bee at the same cost and pains that I have been; doe you make the sad and wofull inference. 4 Look into the Treatises of Learned men; doe any say that there is no more, undoubtedly no more meant in a Commandement but what is directly *prima facie* presented? is that which is to bee reduced to a command, not meant in that Commandement, to which it is properly reduced? 5 In these X words or Commandements, words should not be too much restrained, but taken in their latitude. 6 Is it proper for a man that hath said, *No more undoubtedly no more is meant*, to come in with a *doubtful perhaps* afterwards, and say perhaps there is more meant? 7 Your lesse remarkable addition is a plaine recantation. 8 It is more for Gods honour and yours, to make a free, noble, solemne recantation, and (now you have deceived the Kingdom with three editions) to doe all things like your selfe, ingenuously: a worthy action loses its grace, and our brethren lose their share of benefit by it, when done with so much reservednesse, that others cannot well take notice of it for their edification. Pray Sir, let your recantation bee as remarkable as your seduction; doe not put it at the sag-end of some *lesse remarkable alterations*, acknowledge that you were seduced by——into this opinion, and recant with observation, lest others be seduced by so many hundred Catechismes as are dispersed throughout the Kingdome.

But it may bee that you will deny that you have made a recantation. Truly Sir, first the addition of those words [*in the primary intention of the phrase.*] 2 The putting in of [*Idle*] and blotting out of [*perhaps*] which did much affront your [*No more undoubtedly.*] 3 The change of these words [*the particular matter of Moses his Law was of Promissory (nor Assertory) oaths*] for these [*The matter was peculiarly of promissory, not onely of assertory oaths,*] all these three together will amount to a round recantation, considering that in three editions you had said, there was *No more, and undoubtedly no more* forbidden in the third Commandement; then the breach of promissory oaths.

Ninthly, consider, that if this amendment had been before *Oxford* had been taken, or if you would say that it (as well as another

ther edition of your Book) was intended, before you were in danger to bee called to an account for this and many things of worse consequence, your recantation would bee more satisfactory. I spake to you as a friend, and speake not out of my owne breast, for I doe but repeate the censures of other men. For my owne prart, you have made a solemne profession under your hand to give mee satisfaction, but how will you satisfie other men? 10. Yet I must professe, that I doe not like that expression of yours [Neverthinking to deny or doubt, but that vaine oaths *would bee* forbidden there also.] Doe you mean that they were forbidden by God when *Moses* published the Law, or would bee forbidden afterwards by a superaddition? *Would bee* is not so cleare an expression as is desired. 11. I doe not understand that expression of yours, when you say, [That in kinnesse and submission to the meanest, the Author thought fit to adde.] If you meane it of mee, I take it kindly, for I did speake to your friends at *London* about you, and they promised to tell you positively of it, and I spoke for that end; for I doe respect you more then you thinke I doe: and some worthy friends both of yours and mine know, that neare upon tenne yeares agoe wee did exchange some Letters about your opinion concerning certaine vacuities in the morall Law of God. 12. But Sir, you should consider that Learned men have told you of this error, and therefore say, in submission to better Judgements. 13. Say, in submission to the greatest, even to *zekovab*, the God of glory, I will abase my selfe, recant my errors, and acknowledge the perfection of his morall spirituall Law. Surely it is meet to bee said to God, &c. *Job* 34. 31, 32. I beseech, that you will weep over those two Verses, and then read that passage, *John* 6. 38. Christ came downe from heaven to doe the will of God, &c. Oh, doe you come downe from your Criticisines, come downe from your notions, your imaginary superadditions; which you looke upon as a kind of heaven, and endeavour to doe the will of your Father, revealed in his perfect and spirituall Law, and I'll warrant you you'll finde it so perfect, without any superadditions, that your Evangelicall obedience shall not excell or transcend that excellent rule; nay, you will confesse that you cannot see an end of its perfection, and you will hate every false way. Pardon mee, if I seem to

C 2

preach

A Copy of some Papers

preach to you ; the Lord set it home upon your heart.

3. The next report is, *that you made inclination to sinne an infelicity, not a sinne* : I said, that the Author of that Catechisme did acknowledge that godly sorrow was to be conceived for *all kinds and sorts of sinne* : but when hee descends to particulars, hee speaks with so much irresolution, as if hee doubted whether our aptnesse to fall into all sinne, were an infelicity onely or a sinne.

Sir, your expression is inexcusable, and your apology doth no way satisfie. Truly Sir, you must fall downe at a Throne of grace, and beg pardon of God, and you must speake more positively, or else you will not bee able to give satisfaction to impartiall men.

1 You speake of pollutions of nature : sure that expression is more proper to denote actuall finnes, then originall sinne, which is one entire, universall, and naturall pollution. 2 Every one that is of age to conceive godly sorrow, hath actually consented to the corruption of his nature, hee hath cherished it, and been pleased with it. 3 You seeme to imply, that there must needs bee some consent given to every actuall sinne ; Sir, that is yet to bee proved on your part ; for you are too magisteriall, and so much given to dictates, that you may well stand to bee perpetuall Dictator in Divinity ; every point of a Catechisme should bee exactly proved. 4 You seeme either to recant what you said before, or at least to doubt whether these pollutions bee infelicities onely, or sinne. 5 The danger is the greater, because you expresse such a grand point Sceptically ; there are indeed too many that say, *The corruption of our nature is rather an infelicity then a sinne* ; doe you expresse your selfe thus doubtfully, that you may comply with them ? indeed if you were composing such a Liturgy as some have wished for, that Protestants, &c. might joyne together, I confesse you have sufficiently served that designe : but sure it was your duty, especially in a Practicall Catechisme, to have declared your selfe freely and fully against that dangerous error. 6 If you are of their mind who maintaine the corruption of our nature to bee onely an infelicity, not a sinne ; it was not fairly done to blind your Reader with an Orthodox expression in the beginning of your answer, that you might afterwards tempt him into a dangerous error.

error. 7 It is absurd to say, that godly sorrow is to bee conceived for an infelicity *quà sic*, meerly as an infelicity. 8 There is no doubt but that every sinne should bee wailed *quà sic*, as a sinne: an inconformity to a spirituall Law, and a pronenesse to actuall rebellion against God, and all the commands of God, ought to bee bewailed even with tears of bloud; you need not speake timorously or doubtfully in so weighty and cleare a point. 9 I found the more fault with this doubtfull expression, because you write a Practicall Catechisme, and you know that the corruption of our nature hath great influence into our practise, and therefore you should have been most cleare and expresse in this point, that by Gods grace this pronenesse to sinne might bee both bewailed and mortified. I need not tell you, how many dangerous consequences have been inferred from some doubtfull expressions in Catechismes or confessions about originall sinne, but I hasten to your last report, which is about justification.

4 It seemes you are most to seek here, you desire mee to help you out. Sir, I never said that faith was a *Physicall Instrument* of justification; sure justification is no Physicall thing. You doe grant, at least in termes, that faith is a *Morall instrument* of justification; but if you deny it to bee a *Reall instrument* in receiving Christ, then sure what you grant in termes, you deny in deed. No man ever dreamt that *faith doth pardon sinne*, but a sinner doth by faith receive a pardon: 1 Faith doth receive Christ really, but spiritually, not corporally, or physically. 2 That which you call a sufficient acknowledgement, is not sufficiently cleare, bee pleased to explaine what you meane, when you say [that faith is an instrument in receiving of Christ, and all other acts of the man as Christian, and onely a condition or capacity in the subject to make capable of Gods act upon him in justification.] 3 You should distinguish, as the Apostle doth, between receiving of Christ, and walking in him. 4 If you meane, that all other acts of a Christian, namely acts of repentance, charity, and in a word, all acts of Evangelicall or new obedience, are Morall instruments of justification, I desire a proof of that. 5 Doth my receiving of Christ make mee capable of Christ, or rather make mee possesse of Christ? 6 I thinke you will not deny that Gods act in giving Christ, giving a pardon,

don, &c. is in order of nature before my receiving of Christ, and a pardon. 7 You have not yet clearly expressed, what is the true notion of faith in your opinion, and what Dr. *Preston* saith to confirme you in it, and where he saith it. 8. If you conceive that a cordiall assent to Christs commands hath any influence into our justification, bee pleased to unfold that riddle: you know, it is confessed by all, that the true beleever doth give a cordiall assent to Christs commands; but is hee justified by that assent? 9 How doe you prove, that any soule whilst it remains unjustified doth cordially and wholly give up it selfe to bee ruled by Christ? I confesse it to bee a good evidence of justification, but not an antecedent to (much lesse a Condition to make us capable of) justification. 10 If a cordiall assent to Christs commands, and a resolution of obedience, are morall instruments of justification, bee pleased to shew what efficiency these instruments have in justification; whether the *Terminus* of that efficiency bee a capacity in the soule, which doth formally make the soule capable of Gods act in pardoning sinne, and pronouncing the person just and righteous? 11 If a resolution or vow of obedience bee sufficient unto justification, without the actuall performance of the vow, why doe you winde in *all other acts of a man as Christian*, into a discourse of the very first act of faith, in receiving Christ, and forgiveness of sinnes? 12 If, on the other side, God justifies the ungodly, how doth a constellation of Gospel-graces, and all the acts of grace put a capacity into the subject to make a man capable of justification?

Your last Edition, pag. 28.

Sir, that which I tooke exception at, was your confounding of faith and workes in a discourse of justification. 2 That you doe frequently imply, that wee are justified by faithfull actions, acts of sincerity and obedience, that they are the *Condition* of justification, and that God doth absolutely require them as the *only things by which a man is justified*, p. 28. you say, the condition which makes us capable of pardon of sinnes, is positively the new creature, or renewed, &c. obedience to the whole Gospel, the performing, &c. and Constellation of Gospel-graces, &c. I need not transcribe your words, in your last edition they are to bee found, in the 8 page. 3 You say, that faith without the addition of such workes, such obedience Evangelicall,

call would bee insufficient to justification, &c. The words following are as bad or worse, *page 35, 36.* and the like you have *page 44, 45* Sir, I proved that faith was sufficient to bee an instrument of justification, without the addition of Evangelicall workes unto that purpose, and in that act; and that wee were not justified by a righteousness inherent in us, or any acts of repentance, charity, or new obedience performed by us. I am not ashamed, yet am not now at leisure to repeat my arguments to prove that wee are justified by the obedience of Christ alone, freely imputed by God, applyed and rested on by faith onely.

For Mr. Cheynell.

SIR,

I Received your returns, and the Letter that enclosed them; and shal (as briefly as I can) give you my sence of both. And first to your letter, I shall tell you truly that you are the onely man in the world that ever I knew to have endeavored the confuting one syllable of that Catechisme; and therefore the addresse I made to you, I acknowledge to have made to you onely. If by your *reverend brethren* you meane those which are here with you employed at this time, I suppose your periphrasis hath told mee who they are, and then I am confident they are persons which would have communicated to me any such advertisements, wherein I am so neerly concerned (to discern whether their dislikes were causeless or no) before they had publicly accused me for them: which because they have not done, I must not yet believe that refutation was publique, or such as could bee capable of my notice; though I must acknowledge to expect from either of them that which is, as you say, much more solid then yours, and heartily wish it were either of those to whom I am now writing: for then I should make no question; but the satisfaction (mutually) would bee much greater. But as it is, I must undergoe my fate, and cannot be deceived in the successe of this paper, more then I now finde my selfe to have been in the
reception

reception of my former, which when I had kept my selfe within those limits, which I suppose farre from all motion toward distemper, and onely asked (and as you say beg'd) an exact account of what you had said of that Author, and given you the plaine reasons of my request, is yet charged by you to have *fallen foully* on you: To this reproach of yours I reply not one word (being not so much in love with that part of your spirit as to imitate it; which yet both here and hereafter I beseech you not to mistake for a no-sense-of it) but conceive it as true that I have done so, as that the errors, so styled by you, are either errors, or dangerous. I will not doubt of your employments or disturbances, nor thinke your returnes are too slow, I wish you had more leisure, and more perfect tranquillity of thoughts at all times, especially when I have the luck to discourse with you. In the mean, I beseech you to beleieve, that what question soever may depend concerning the Messengers delivering his errand (whom yet, upon his asseveration that he did it aright, I must beleieve) there can be none of the words in my letter, or consequently of the addition in yours, *viz.* of the [*this night*] wherein I conceived you obliged to give me that account, when you have my paper by you to assure you, that I did not.

The words which you affirme to have taken notice of in your *Carfax-Sermon*, I acknowledge to bee in the Catechisme, and must set them downe againe in this paper, that you may judge, while I advise with you, whether you mistooke them, or no. [*The holy Ghost was our advocate in settling a Ministry to pray and intercede for their severall congregations (and enabling them in the very Apostles times to forme a Liturgy to continue in the Church to that end) and thereby helping our infirmities, and teaching us to pray as we ought.*] You see Sir, and must acknowledge, the parenthesis in the midst of the sentence; and (I suppose) know the meaning of that, that it is so set, that it may unite the words after to the words before it, not pretend to joine them to it selfe; So that the sentence without the parenthesis is this (and not altered by it) *That the holy Ghost was our advocate in settling a Ministry to pray and intercede for their severall congregations, and thereby helping our infirmities, and teaching us to pray as we ought.* Onely 'tis added by the by, that the holy Ghost that thus settled that Ministry, enabled them in the Apostles times to forme a Liturgy to continue

tinue in the Church to that end, viz. of praying and interceding for their severall congregations. To either of these thus set (as onely these words can bee set in construction) your questions are wholly impertinent, i. e. doe no way ingage him that had said these words, to satisfie your severalls. (and I am not over willing now to engage my selfe to answer any more then the matter requires of mee.) For first, the saying that the holy Ghost enabled the Ministry in the very Apostles times to forme a Liturgy to continue in the Church, doth not conclude that that very Liturgy was to bee continued, as in the second and fourth question you change the words, which you needed not have done, unlesse you meant to get advantage by it, and from thence to conclude it my opinion, that there was some necessity, that that Liturgy formed in the Apostles times should bee continued in the Church, as I am told you collected thence: but, you see, I said not, and professe not to have meant in those words [to continue] but onely that it might continue (i. e. if the Church thought good) either so as it was, or with such additions or alterations as the Church should thinke fit; as hee that leaves lands to continue to his heires, obliges not them from ever alienating them, or exchanging. You see, the utmost that these words [to continue] on which all the weight of your exceptions lie, can bee extended. And that comes not home to your [was to bee continued,] nor to your questions, which are built upon it. I need say no more to your second *quære*; And yet if I thought you sought for any thing but exceptions in my Papers, I would adde freely, as to a Scholar, or friend, my whole sense of this matter, as a little conversation with ancient Writers hath made it up to mee. For once, 'tis this; That the Apostles, and those that were by the holy Ghost consecrated to the planting of the Church, had the gifts of miracles; not every one all, but one one, another another, powred on them; that, among these, in those first times, there was *χαρισμα ἰατρικόν*, the gift of prayer, (that gift a miracle, as the gift of healing, prophesying, &c.) that this was bestowed *ἰς ἰσχυρὰ*, that did pray for the rest, and aske those things that were usefull for them, and teach others how to pray; that some of the prayers thus conceived by them, which were fit for the common perpetuall uses of all Christians, were received and kept by those whom they

thus taught; that those are they which the Ancients mean by Liturgies of St. James, St. Mark, &c. Though I believe not, that either all these are in those Liturgies which now wee have under their names, nor that all that are under their names are those, That in the celebration of the Sacrament, which they daily used, some formes were constantly observed by them, no new occasion making it fit to alter them: Of which sort I little doubt of the Lords prayer, the *ἀναλόγη* anon mentioned, from [lift up your hearts,] to [therefore with Angels, &c.] *includend*; after that a prayer, called * *ἐπίκλησις*; then the words of consecration, taken from the Gospell: These, I suppose, I have good authority to thinke constantly used among them, and the blessing of God hath brought them downe to us. Beside these, I make no question but variety of other prayers according to the exercise of that *χάρισμα* were poured out by him that was so endowed, and those I call not (as I would doe the other, and whatever else there was of that nature) set formes in the Apostles times, but plainly exercises of that gift. But then as those formes were preserved and continued, so when those extraordinary *χάρισμα* ceased, there was need of somewhat else to supply that place; and that would not bee in any reason to permit every man to pray as hee would (for that was the thing for the preventing of which, and the unhappinesse consequent to it, the *χάρισμα* *ἐν χάριτι* had before been given, which but in that respect had not before been usefull) but set prepared forms for the daily constant wants, and those provided by the Governors of the Church, Apostolicall men, which had so benefited under the prayers of those that had the *χάρισμα*, or perhaps remembred some formes of theirs, at least the method and manner used by them, that their formes might well deserve to be heeded by, and so continue in the Church, at least were likely to bee fitter for the turne then the unpremeditated effusions of them that now had not the extraordinary *χάρισμα*, and of all whom it cannot bee presumed that they have the ordinary wisdom to pray alwayes as they ought. I conceive, I can satisfie any reasonable man for the maine of what I have now said, upon those grounds that are fit for a manner of this kinde. I meane is not for a new ball of contention betweene us; I shall satisfie your exceptions to the Author without it. And that is all

* τὸ ἀγιν
πνεύματι,
after which,
ἐκ ἑστῆς ἁγίας
ἀνάγκης, ἀλλὰ
χρηστὸς ἐστὶ.
Ep. Col. 4.

all my answer to your second *quære*. And for your first, I say, that speech concludes mee no undertaker, nor obliges mee to shew you that Liturgy, any more then my telling you, that as Christ taught his Disciples to pray; so *John Baptist* before him taught his, will oblige mee to tell you what the *Baptists* forme was: The Disciples tell mee, the *Baptist* did teach his Disciples to pray, and 'tis possible they could not, I am sure they did not help you to the sight of that prayer: and the Authors meannesse, or his being so farre lesse authentically then those Disciples, though it may make it more fit for you to dis-beleeve his report that they formed a Liturgy; yet will it not, to thinke him more obliged to give you a copy of it, or to acknowledge it temerarious to have said that they did forme one, because hee hath it not ready to shew. Other reasons, beside that of cleare ocular demonstration, may bee thought worthy our heeding in matters of fact; the testimony of men nearer those times then wee are: And under that head I conceive there are many things to be produced; for whether the Liturgies that goe now under the name of *St. Marke* and *St. James* are the very Copies compiled by them or no, it is to mee no improbable argument that that age which first acknowledged them to bee theirs, had been taught by Story that there were some written by them, upon which they thought fit to father those upon them. Besides this, you have been shewed in another place from *1 Cor. 14. 26.* that in the Apostles times some of the *Psalmes* of *David* or *Asaph* were used ordinarily in their devotions, and that *St. Paul* found fault that they did not all joyne in the same *Psalm* at the same time, which would, saith hee, bee best for edification: and if it were mended upon *St. Pauls* admonition, the use of those very *Psalmes* were (at least a part of) a publique divine service, which is the English of Liturgy. Secondly, that, if wee beleeve Stories, *St. James* made choice of some speciall prayers most frequently used by the Apostles, shorned againe by *St. Basil* and *Saint Chrysostome*; all which the *Greeke Church*, which is fitter to judge (in this matter done among them) then wee, doe still retaine, and make no doubt of the Authors of them. Thirdly, that there is famous mention of a short forme of *St. Peters*, used alone, they say, for a great while in the *Roman Church*. Fourthly, that 'tis cleare, that *St. Augustine* speaking of *Guthin words*, &c.

View of Dic.
pag. 14.

faith, that they are *verba ab ipsis Apostolorum temporibus petita*, and so the compiler of the Apostles Constitutions, which imitates that antiquity, and makes use of that forme, must be thought to have beleev'd, or else he had been much mistaken in his imitation, and had put off his disguise, even by putting it on. 5 That the same words with those in our Liturgy, are not only in the Liturgy which is said to be St. James's, and those other of St. Basil, and St. Chrysostome, but are recited by St. Cyrill of Jerusalem (in his Catechisme) one of the Ancientest Authors we have. If it may be with your leasure (though, as I said, I undertake not to demonstrate, yet) to offer to your judgment; not to breed you more controversies or disturbances, I shall not onely refer you to Cassander to prove that to Christs words in the Lords Supper, the Apostles added the use of the Lords prayer, (which though it were not much, is more then nothing of set forme, or Liturgy, and might doubtlesse have been accompanied with much more, though I am not able to shew it you) but also goe a little farther with you, upon occasion of that last mentioned forme, and that Father.

The forme of doxology, following those verses of *sursum corda*, &c. in our Book, is, you may remember, this; [Therefore with Angels, &c.] of which there is little question, but that it is the form which was called by the Greeks *ὑμνωδία*, by the Latines *Preparatio* (viz. of the Sacrament, as 'tis stil in our Church) that *ἀνθ'* or *σέξν*, which, saith *Iust. Mar.* precedeth the Eucharist, or blessing of the elements, i. e. prayer of consecration; *ὑμνωδία, ἀνολογία, δοξολογία, ἐκ τῶν Σακραμῶν*, by Cyrill of Jerusalem, which as it is there placed after the *ὑψακεία*, i. e. (not the Sacrament, but) the giving of thanks, (as with us it is after the [Let us give thanks to our Lord God]) so it is before the prayer of consecration; (which other where, as even now in *Iustin*, is called by that title, and the Sacrament *ἀνθ' ὑψακείας*) as with us also, and is the very *ἡ δόξα καὶ ὁ ὕμνος*, which, saith that ancient Author, under the Apostolical disguise of *Dionysius*, the whole Church profess before the Sacrament. All this I have said, to shew you (if you delight in it) some part of that Liturgy (& being in our book you may yet see it) which was by those Ancients used: And to bring it yet nearer home to the point in hand, 'tis that ancient *Cyrill's* affirmation of this very form, that it was *μεγίστην αἴτην*; which words, in the use of those Ancients, most commonly note the thing they speak of to be delivered them from

from the Apostles, or Apostolicall men; and being spoken by *Cyrill* who was not long after those times, and *S. August.* saying expressly of *sursum corda* (which may very probably extend to this whole *ἀνωτορία* after it) that they were delivered down from the very Apostles times; I conceive this, with the other precedent testimonies of it, may amount to a proof tolerably sufficient to perswade a prudent man that they were so. I will prevent a mistake in this matter of *Cyrill's* words, which I do not think probable you would fall into, but yet am willing to serve you by preventing it, that the Greek [*μεγαλοψάλει ὑμῖν ἐκ τῶν Σεραφίμων τολόγιον τῶν ἀγγέλων*] imports not, as I conceive, that it was delivered by the Seraphim, (for then it would be *ἀπὸ*; and though that were more then an Apostolicall, even an Angelical tradition; yet it would rather look to the [*Glory to God on high*] &c. (but that it is an hymne taking in the Angels to joyn in lauds with us, (to which I conceive *S. Chrysostome* referred in his *μῦθ'* ἀγγέλων ᾄδοντων ἡ ἁγία ὑμνῶν, and the *Greekes* that call it *χαρυβιχὴς*, and *Amabarium*, when hee styles it *hymnus referens laudibus Angelorum*,) and this hymne delivered downe ὑμῖν by (our *i. e.*) that *Cyrill's* ancestors at least, which who they were likely to bee, I before gave you reason to conjecture. That this thus mentioned by *St. Cyrill*, is that very part of our Liturgy, which I noted it to bee, is cleare enough by the words that follow in him [*ὅπως καὶ νῦν τοῖς ἁγίοις ὑμνωδῶντες αὐτὸν ὑμνοῦμεν καὶ ὑμνοῦμεν ὑμῖν*,] compared with our [*With all the the company of heaven wee laud and praise, &c.*] and that they are placed as wee place them, by the *ὡς αἰνέσουσιν αὐτὸς διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν τῶν ὑμῶν μετὰ τὸν φιλόθεον πατέρα διὰ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐξαποστολαίαν ἐν τῷ σωματικῷ, &c.* noting this Hymne to bee immediately before the* confederation; and to prepare men for it, which the Liturgick Writers meane by calling it *prefatio actionis, & hymnatio precedens confirmationem sacramenti*, and so with us it is continued. If I should proceed to give you any more arguments, to perswade you that the Apostles did use set formes of publique divine Service, and mention those formes to you, I should hope but for little thanks from you, and therefore shall abstaine from that profusion, remembering that all that I am this

* Or that Prayer that I told you was called *ἐπιτέλεσις*, wherein they prayed for the *ἐπιτέλεσις*, or *ἐκτέλεσις* πνεύματος ἐν τῷ σωματικῷ. An ancient forme of which wee have in *St. Basil's* Liturgy, *ὡς δὲ λέγουσιν, &c.* ἐλθὲν τὸ πνεῦμα σὺ τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ἡ ἐπὶ τὰ σωματικά. Δόξα ταῦτα, καὶ εὐχαρίστησιν αὐτῷ καὶ δόξα καὶ ἀντιφώνησις.

A Copy of some Papers

minute about to prove, is, that I am not bound to shew you that Liturgy which was said to be formed in the Apostles times. And having said this, I suppose you will discern what my answer would bee, (if I were obliged by my former words, to give you any as you see I am not) to your other questions; or for feare you should mistake againe, I will, *ex abundanti*, return you my opinion; To the third, that hee doth; To the fourth, that they may; (I wish I could adde, they alwayes doe; but I am not obliged to that;) To the fifth, that it is not, if you meane by [that very] the same without any change: but yet in the sense that *Thelous* his ship came home the same that it went out, and is an instance in Logick of one notion of *idem numero*; I conceive it, if possible, more then the very same, having some of the same ribs remaining in it (as even now I instanced, and professe to bee perswaded by those Authorities,) when that is supposed to have never a one. I have no occasion to add any more in answer to the Letter; but to thanke Mr. Reynolds and you for your willingnesse to give mee directions about my first fruits; though the truth is, I am returned from London, and did speake to my Brother to aske L. Gen. Cromwells assistance; but Sir Henry Vane junior is not of that Committee. Sir Henry Vane senior was in the Chaire, and I delivered my case to him, and hee fully consented to the justice of my request: and then your saying, *Sir Henry Vane hath power to relieve me*, shall be ground of hope to me that he will.

NOW for the longer, and so sadder part of my taske, wherein you are not so courteous to me, as you were in that concluding line of your Letter, I must proceed to that.

In the entrance I must have leave to bee sorry, that I have to deale with a man that will professe himselfe not much taken with that notion of Justice (which I said obliged mee to desire an exact account in writing from you, of that wherein that Author was nearly concerned; and could no otherwise bee sure not to thinke any thing of you causelessly.) If this were not justice to you, or may not yet be believed so by you, I

desire

despise of ever doing any thing acceptable in your presence. Our humours, or our principles, will be so contrary, that what ever I shall say, I shall have reason to suspect you will not bee much taken with it; yet I shall farther adventure to give you one relation, which will not onely clear my former notion of justice to you, but offer to your consideration whether there bee not somewhat due from you by that notion of justice (or some other) to that Author, to others, yea and to your selfe.

There fell out in some Lay-company in this Towne, since your Sermon fore-mentioned, a discourse, Whether it were not lawfull to sweare, so that that which was sworn were exactly true; one of the company insisted right, that it was not, the other was confident it was, and produced for it the Authority of that Author; and to prove that againe, said, that the Preacher at St. Maries read it out of that Book. Of the truth of this he was so confident, that he presently resolved to make use of that liberty, which he beleaved from your citation to bee the opinion of that Author, more then his carnall heart did permit him to beleave the truth of what you added (if you did any thing besides the reproaching of that Author) in confutation of that Doctrine, and thereupon he swore a great Oath, that that which was before him was a candlestick, and perswaded himselfe that he had done no hurt in doing so.

Now Sir, when I have againe told you, and all the world; that that Author hath written most strictly against swearing, (and onely differs from you in that question concerning the primary intention of the words of the old Commandement) and said in plaine words, 1 That idle, foolish, wanton using of Gods name, (which if it be not in oaths, is lesse then swearing) sure profane using of it, (which in all the editions was in, and absolutely belonged to all kinde of unlawfull oaths) might bee resolved to bee forbidden there by reduction: And 2 That under Christ (which againe I tell you, belonged to all to whom that Catechisme could speake,) there is a totall universall prohibition of swearing it selfe, making that as unlawfull now, as perjury was before. 3 That to sweare in ordinary conversation is utterly unlawfull. 4 That all voluntary, especially promissory oaths, are now utterly unlawfull for a Christian. And 5 those voluntaries defined, to be those that have their impellent or principle

A Copy of some Papers

riple from my selfe; when I have, I say, told you all this, then for Gods sake ponder sadly with your owne heart, in case that poore soule bee ever tormented in hell for that vaine oath, (as without Gods mercy upon repentance, undoubtedly hee will) how much you have to charge upon your selfe for giving him confidence that that Author had said what hee learnt from you: especially seeing your Sarcasme in that phrase of *the much admired Catechisme*, might tell you that it was possible some poore, passionate, sinfull creature, might thus unhappily admire it. I conjure you, not to thinke there is any jest in this, but beleieve from mee, that I am able to produce the person that heard it, (and that had that care and love of piety and of truth, and that particular knowledge of my detesting all oaths, as to come in some passion to mee for satisfaction,) and that I have already seriously sent to disabuse the offender, lest that sinne should bee laid to his charge, which you have made that Book bee the occasion of; and when you have laid this to your heart, the God of all grace direct you to doe your duty in this particular.

I will not confute your opinion, that I have stooped lower in my Rejoynder then I was in my Letter, by begging what I did before but desire, (I will bee very willing to do so alwayes, and shall yett bee more vile then so, if that may perswade you to doe mee justice;) and yet it may bee observed, that in your judgment to desire and request (which I did before) is so much lower then to beg, (which is but a nicety,) that untill I did beg, as well as desire and request, and againe re-inforce my request, you did not thinke fit to grant me the least crumbe of that justice which I desired from you.

At the phrase [*exact account*] you affirme your selfe to have stumbled, and call it [*those hard words*.] If this bee so, I cannot tell how to behave my selfe so cautiously, as either to speak plainely enough to you, or to keep you from stumbling. For [*exact account*] is so plaine to bee understood, and so unlike *jurisdiction*, unlesse you mistooke it for *exacting an account*, (which you are too subtile to doe, when the word *desire* went before it,) that if ever I had exercised jurisdiction over you, or any other, (which I never was in place to doe: the Office for which my first fruits are required, being without a jurisdiction annex to it;) yet you could not have been tempted by that

to this mistake. I suppose you were pleased to be merry, when you imply you were; and therefore must friendly admonish you, that there is a shrewd disease, in which *Irenaeus* had so much skill as to pronounce *ἡ αἰὶς γλῶσσι τὴν μὴ πολλὴν ἔχουσι*, and therefore I shall briefly desire you, that hereafter you speak, 1 So properly as not to say *desiring*, is *exercising jurisdiction*. And 2 Seriously, (for truly I am not in jest, when I write to you,) and that would have kept you safe from stumbling. Yet because you are at such leisure as to remember I had an Office in your now Countrey, I shall tell you that there is a seale belonging to that Office, from which, if you had induction to that Living, you may read in your Wax, *καὶ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐνδεδυσμένος*, and then you will soone discern how many men, as well as mee, you have helpt to make happy. I blesse God, (and will never curse you,) that I am one of that number.

In your next Section, you pray for them that suggested so many false accusations against you to mee. But first, you affirme not above one to have been false; and that I confesse to bee so; and need not to bee told so back againe. As for your new accusation, which you are resolved to pay mee in stead of that former, I desire you to know that I defie it, and know no danger or ill found in the language of *Speculative mysterie*, nor acknowledge any Author of it whom you can suspect; particularly, not him whose name you blotted out, so that I might read; I meane, neither *Smalcus* nor *Socinus*, whose doctrines in the businesse of the Trinity I doe heartily disclaime; and am so farre from being tainted or tempted by them, that I cannot say I ever permitted my selfe to read any Tract in them, or any other of that set, (unlesse in the *Racovian Catechisme*) on that subject. And you will never repair the injury, if you use arts to fasten it on mee, or to perswade any man, that I was ever inclined towards it. For your nicety by which you except against my calling the doctrine of the Trinity a *Speculative mysterie*, saying that it is *practicall*; and giving your reason, [because the blessed Trinity is the object of our worship, as well as of our faith;] I shall make no scruple to acknowledge the Trinity to bee the object of our worship, (and to that end I directed, that concluding act of my worship to that blessed object,) and every point of that which in the Catechisme is made

due to God, I supposed there, and now professe to bee perfectly due to the Trinity. But then you might remember, that you acknowledge it the object of our faith; and of that there be many parts which will not be disparaged by being stiled mysteries and depths of speculation, and in that sense, or as they are so, I then spake, and onely so, and need not acknowledge any impropriety in that speech; because though a speculative doctrine may be also practicall in another respect, as the knowledge of the causes of diseases is a practicall knowledge in respect of the cures it will help to worke, yet as that is ordinarily called the *Theory* of Physick, and is presumed before Students ascend to the practicall; so I told you the Author supposed the speculative understanding of that mystery in the Church-Catechisme, before hee came to the Doctrines in this Booke, which are the practicall. You remember mee, that a Sacramentall Covenant is practicall; and I may as well remember you that there are *credenda* proposed to the vower in that Sacrament, as well as *facienda*.

On occasion of mention of the Church-Catechisme, you say, you like that better then my Practicall, and I confesse my selfe to doe so too; so vehemently, that I beleeve 'twill bee long ere wee see a better in its stead. But yet I conceive, that hee that hath learnt that, may bee capable of more, at least of directions to make use of that knowledge imbibed to the amendment of his life: else, most of our preaching were in vaine; nay else, both that Catechisme ought never to have been expounded, and every one that hath written any thing else for the benefitting of youth or men, must lye under the prejudice of that insolence of thinking himselfe able to make a better, as well as this Author.

For your justice in that answer to the third reason, I am not to thanke you, nor can I thinke that any man that was in any measure my friend, needed to bee told by you or any, that I acknowledged the Trinity. If hee did, examine your owne heart, whether you know not some body, who had helped to defame mee in that particular, by saying I was a *Socinian* or the like, or by saying I maintaine many errors broached by such. If you doe not, I will thank you for the good office you mention, and for hasten also; and with hearty I could make more haste

haste to get into some more delightfull employment) to the second report.

In that, I see, I met with no false accusation of you, but in you enough of injury to that Author, by picking out what might make him odious, and present him an eloquent learned disciple of yours, to bee taught, that swearing is a sinne; or rather a profane designer and corrupter of the Nation; that hath given Boyes a liberty of swearing in their Catechismes. I have sufficiently told you, and all men, that that Author is most guiltlesse of that charge, and if you will not yet acknowledge it, I must leave it to God to judge betwixt us; as also, whether hee produce not the unquestionable command of God against all swearing, assertory or promissory; and whether you doe not imply, that hee doth so, in saying against him that [*the perhaps imaginary superaddition*] (which you know are no other then the words of Christ) *will not bee so effectuell to restrain; as the unquestionable command of God.* Sir, doth hee question the Command of God to bee against swearing? doth hee not say that all profane use of Gods name is sure forbidden under the third Commandement of the Law by reduction? (or is not all unlawful swearing, assertory as well as promissory, a profane using of his name?) that I may not adde that hee produces, and earnestly insists on the direct clear command of Christ against all voluntary oaths, which is unquestionably a Command of God to any that is not worse then a *Socinian*, and denies Christ to bee God at all. And whereas you observe by the way, that there is liberty given by this Author for assertory oaths, doe you thinke there was not that liberty for some sort of them? or doth the Author say there was for all sorts of them? or for any that were voluntary? Hee supposes the primary intention of the third Commandement (and of these words, *thou shalt performe, &c.* against non-performance of promissory oaths) to bee against perjury; Under that, by reduction, to bee forbidden (not swearing simply taken, and so not all assertory oaths, but) all profane using of Gods name, which sure containes assertory oaths, though not them onely, or all of that sort, because some others doe profane Gods name; and of these, all doe not, but onely those that use it unnecessarily. This is sufficient indeed to conclude all kinde of assertory oaths, not to bee the particular

matter of *Moser* Law, and indeed no sort of them to be so much as reducible thither, but onely those where his name is unnecessarily used; but sure those that are such, it doth not give any liberty to, nor can you think it did, without pronouncing at the same time, that 'twas contradicted in the next page, which I must suppose you were able to see, because you lookt so narrowly here to finde this hole, which I am perswaded never any the most carnall man ever took notice of, to encourage himself in his sinne, till you directed him to it. By which you may see, that some men are more industrious in finding faults to accuse their brethren, then others in seeking pretences to excuse themselves.

To your Arguments I shall endeavour to say little, partly as not apprehending the force of them, partly supposing that we now talke of a matter of fact, which may be tryed by evidence; the Booke being ready to prove the truth of what I affirme from it; and then tis not in the power of a 1000 probable arguments (much lesse of a few dis-joynted) to wrest any man out of such a certainty. I should willingly venture them to any Reader to doe their worst on him, especially your first, whereby you would shew that hee cannot prove the Doctrine of a totall universall prohibition of swearing it selfe, and making it as unlawfull now, as perjury was before, unlesse hee lose the totall in a cypher. Where sure, Sir, 1 If a man would bind you to your words, you are now much lesse an enemy to swearing *in universum*, then the Author was: for otherwise that would not bee objected, that hee prohibits more of that kinde then hee can prove. And 2 for mincing the totall into a cypher, you will have no reason to feare, for though hee should mince the totall somewhat, and say with (I assure you not from) *Smalcimus* (for who doth not say so too?) that I must not sweare, but for Gods glory, and the publique good; yet is not that all cypher, I hope, for it prohibits all swearing in communication, as utterly unlawfull; all voluntary, especially promissory oaths. But then, Sir, you must know that a totall prohibition of sweating it selfe, containes all swearing by any creature, as well as by God, and that is no cypher neither.

As for your question, Whether the perfect Law of God did give men leave to take vaine oaths? hee is willing most clearly

to satisfie that, and assure you of his opinion, that it did not; and because by the whole period I cannot possibly conclude any thing but onely this, that you know not why I used the word Totall, (*a totall universall prohibition of swearing*) I will tell you that too; because Christ had said, *μὴ ὀμόσας ὅλως, swear not at all*; which what it signifies, is here sufficiently explained; thus, not onely not by God, but not by any creature of God neither.

2 In the difference, as you state it, betwixt us, you are very unjust, in saying I undertooke to prove, that by the third Commandement there was no more meant, then that a man should not forswear himselfe. This is false; I never undertooke it, but professe that what is forbidden by *reduction*, is meant as *truly*, though not so *evidently* proposed, as what is *expressed*, and therefore you must bee content to open your eyes, and see what is the question between the *Scholar* and the *Catechist*, (and the same also is the conclusion) *viz.* not what is meant, *i. e.* what is the full adequate importance of that Commandement, or what it contains under it; but what that is, *i. e.* what the words strictly signifie, or, as 'tis now expressed, what is the *primary intension* of the phrase; and to that question the answer is made [*no more undoubtedly but forswearing*]; as if the question were askt of [*ἐπιχρύσευς*] is that no more then that *thou shalt not commit adultery*? I should answer, *no more undoubtedly*; yet never feare that any man would thinke that I affirmed, that *fornication*, and all other *villany* was not there forbidden, especially when I had also added, that it were by *reduction*; and so in like manner, to take the question that you after set, whether I will say there is no more meant by the Commandement then *taking away the life of a man*; I answer, that the word *killing* is no more, and that was all the Author said of the third Commandement, *viz.* that the Commandement in *Exod.* (that is, the words of the Commandement (which are there set down) *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine*) is no more then *forswearing*; that the words were the subject spoken of, 'tis plaine by the proofes produced of it, from the use of those words in other places. This is so probable a truth, that I could not have thought it needfull to have given it illustration to any man else.

3. When I appeal'd to Christ as Judge, and thought I had

made good may appeale by producing his words whereby hee renders that *Commandement*, *ἡ ὀρκισμὸς* [*thou shalt not forswear;*] you attempt to argue and prove against mee, but never take notice of my prooffe, which is absolutely against law of pleading or disputing. And for the argument you confront to it, I assure you it perswades mee nothing, but that you thought *μωρὸν* was to bee written with a. For though I shall tell you that all oaths, that come from evill or from the Devill, are not from thence concluded to bee evill or devillish, because the oath that I take lawfully in Judicature may come originally from evill or from the devill in another, and must not needs bee from evill in the taker, so I have no need to answer you with that, but plainly confesse, that all evill and devillish oaths are forbidden in the third Commandement.

4 I need not deny but that *new* may sometimes be rendred vaine, and so sometimes 'tis, even when it signifies a *Lye*, (as *ψευδος* in the Bible hath a peculiarity sometimes to denote *Idols*, those greatest lyes in the world.) All that I was to conclude was, that *Christ* having exprest it by a word which St. *Matthew* here reads *ἡ ὀρκισμὸς*, there was nothing in that *Hebrew* phrase, but what was agreeable to this, and that is true, though it should bee granted to signifie *vanum*, because it doth *falsum* also. But you say, you need not goe about to prove that the *Jewes* saw this truth as clearely as wee doe, but you can prove that they saw and acknowledged it, and that that is sufficient for you, and then let mee tell you, you have fought blind all this while, and now you may see, if you will, that forasmuch as concerns this Author (unlesse you will fight on, when you say you need not) your great quarrell is at an end, for hee that said in generall of all this *Sermon* in the *mount*, that *Christ* added either *new precepts*, or *new light*, promised to bee satisfied with either of them: and though hee conceives the * *Greek Fathers* to have generally affirmed the former, and the *Latin* also, for the first 400 yeares, (particularly in this matter of swearing, *Theophylact*, οὐκ ἔνι μωρὸν πρὸς, καὶ τὸ δὲ χρεῖσθαι ἐστὶ μωρὸν: expressing his opinion to bee, that some swearing was *μωρὸν* under *Christ*, which had not been so before) yet hee hath obliged himselfe to bee content with the latter, which now, you say, you need not deny, (I would you had never needed to oppose one so violently,

* See the testimonies of the Fathers both Greek and Latine, in the Catechisme pag. 106. not thought fit then to swell up this Letter.

lently, that asserted no more, then what you need not to deny;) and therefore I will now adde onely thus much, that ~~but~~ This is the meaning and effect of affirming it [forbidden there, not by the *primary* intention of the word] for from thence it is that the clearnesse arises; that which is forbidden by *reduction* only, being not so cleare, nor consequently so deeply obliging those to whom it is not (supposing still that it is not their fault, that it is not) so cleare. 2 That if it were granted, that *Christ* gave a *new precept* here, it would not yet follow, that all unlawful swearing by *Gods name* was not forbidden before: because there is another thing which he may have added to the third *Commandement*, the not swearing by *any thing else*, as well as not by *God*. But, you see, I need not now affirme this: I will give you leave to thinke that I am so awed by you, that I am not willing to spring you any new game of controversies. I confesse I like not the sport so well, as to sollicite your company any further.

For the *Septuaginta in margin*, I gave you an hint by the way, that that will gaine you but little.

For my knowledge of the *primary* signification of *new* you must not judge, for hee that shall but looke into *Schindler* (as venerable an Author sure as *Pagnin*) will finde that hee saith 'tis used: *de re falsâ; vanâ; First falsâ; but* if you had pleased, my argument of the use of the word in the *ninth Commandement* (as fit to expound the *Second* as any) might have been thought as fit to be considered, as what you have insisted on in stead of it.

You doe well to abstaine from the *negative* argument of [hee might but did not.] But then it is not true that the question betwixt you and mee is not about the *primary* intention of the phrase: for whosoever reads that *Catechisme*, these letters, or even many of your arguments, will know it is; or if not, I make no scruple to pronounce, what I have done so oft, that I have no other quarrell to you in this matter, save onely the injuries you did mee at *St. Maries*, and every one that beleevved ought of it from you. But sure, Sir, I have not acknowledged in any manner, that the first edition of that Booke had any thing in it questionable in the judgement of learned men; I told you it was *in kinde* and *submission* rather than *kindness*, *kindness*.

A Copy of some Papers

kindnesse and *submission* intimates no more acknowledgement of questionablenesse, then the word *meanest* intimates the *learnedst*. I would now adde, that I might have done it to prevent causelesse quarrelling, but that I now see that it will not doe that neither.

As for your long deduction and magnifying of your cost and travaile through the additions, &c. of that *Catechism*, you might have been lesse Playesome *in rescrib*. If you doe not already know that you have prevaricated herein, you may read and remember the *Printers* Postscript (which I think you cite also, and so have read, I shall now but advise you to remember it) and you cannot chuse but see, (and, I hope, acknowledge) that all your Fable vanishes, and your History ends in this plaine brieve, that will bring no scorne on the *Authour*, viz. that he prepared a new edition of the *Catechisme*; added a third part more; and, to serve the meanest, explained every thing that by any advice or hint hee observed to need explaining; call it *altering*, if you will, for to alter from worse to better hee professes himselfe to thinke an amiable, imitable quality, and will never bee ashamed of it: yet must not now assume it to himselfe, having, I assure you, no right to it, any further then it signifies *explaining*. This edition had long since been Printed in *Oxford*, could the Printer have gotten downe so much paper. When the City was rendred twas carryed to *London* to that end, where against the Authors will or knowledge three editions had been made by the first Copy, one of which was just then ended; and by that meanes the *Printer* had been at greater losse then I was willing to bee cause of to an enemy, if another new impression had been then made of it. This, God knows, was the cause it is now set out so troubledly (the *Printer* being willing to put out the additions thus, rather then not at all; and to put this inconvenience on the *Reader*, then losse upon himselfe) for which, though I was very sorry, yet I never foresaw that I should bee thus chid and reproacht, and triumpht over for it. I hope some of the *unseasonablenesse* in Christs Sermon may bee the portion of them that suffer without a cause, though it bee not upon that excellent stile [for righteousness sake.] I am sure, this of mine is not for unrighteousnesse. And now as seriously you shall judge of the thing called *exercising of patience*, and never expect

pest to be thank for your charges, unlesse it had brought in to mee more justice (I need not say charity) from you. And if after this, nothing will satisfie you but *recantation*, so oft repeated *recantation* (O that this *epitaph* might bee changed into that of the Apostles, of the *hereticke*) get mee but some Expedient that lying shall bee no sinne, and that no other sinne in you or others shall bee consequent to it in this, and for the other part of it, if it can delight you more then the calling for it hath done already, you shall have my most willing consent towards it. For the latter end of the sheet, of *deceiving the Kingdoms*, of *seduction*, &c. and what followes in the next, to the end of the report, I am sensible of it, and I thanke God I have received grace from him to pray that I may make the same use of it, that *David* doth in the story of *Shimei's* reviling, 2 Sam. 16. 10. I pray also, and desire the prayers of all good men, that God would shew me the sin which hath now brought this portion of calumny upon mee, and that is all I would say to it. And yet, after this resolved silence to that part, I shall againe answer to you some few things. 1 That when in your fourth consideration you say [*meant in a Commandement*] you should say, *signified by the words of a Commandement*. 2 That which you call, *taking in a latitude*, I call *reduction*. 3 That my explications were designed by mee to bee as remarkable, nay much more then the first edition was: for I designed a full impression, and many other things to make them so. 4 I never had any thing to doe (not so much as the knowledge, at that time) with the setting out any edition of that book, save onely of those additions, and of printing the first few copies at *Oxford*, for the use of those that were more willing to bee at that charge, then at a greater in transcribing it. 5 I say most distinctly, that every emendation in that Booke, that to my utmost remembrance I can speak of, was intended long before ever the Towne was neare taking: and for danger of being called to an account of any thing said in it, God knows my simplicity, I was never neare dreaming or thinking of it, and am now in courage enough to feare neither men nor Angels in that particular. 6 That I know not, that ever I have made you a solemne possession under my hand to give you satisfaction; and my most carefull recollecting what I have wrote, cannot

bring it to my remembrance: certainly you dreamt of that together with the *round recantation*. If it were any thing above endeavouring it, certainly it was a very rash promise; and if so, I beseech you remit it to mee, for I would not willingly take any more paines about it. For other men, I am more secure: and if you once be satisfied, I shall suppose all men, that know it, will thinke it time for them to give over quarrelling. 7 That by [*would*] I did in effect meane, were forbidden also by God, when *Moses* published the Law; and have oft told you how I meant so. 8 I have already told you, that you came not into my heart, when I thought or spake of submission to the meanest: and wonder as much, that you should thinke the alterations were made in *submission to you*, as that you should now rank your selfe with the meanest, who have not supererogated in humility since I met with you. Truly, Sir, I doe not thinke, meannesse is the cause of your mis-understandings, nor did I ever from any friend at *London* heare of any particular you disliked in it: or if I had, by any such message, I would have found out some way to have offered you or any man living a friendly debate about it. For your respects, I finde little signes of them now, and by the subjects doe beleve that there were little exprest in those letters of yours ten yeares agoe about mee, I can, and doe freely forgive you all; but know not that I am bound to thanke you, till some body else tell mee so. 9 If any learned men ever told me of that opinion about *Christ improving the Law*, and exprest themselves to thinke it were an error, I am confident I have given them such a state of my opinion in that matter, that no good Christian can finde fault with, or lay any charge on it of hurt or danger to any mans manners, if it were suppoed false. And besides, you may know, that as Learned as any this age now hath, both of Ancients and others, are fully of my opinion: And let me tell you, that ten yeares agoe I had no objection against my opinion, but that it was by some men fathered on *Socinus*: but knowing, that I beleevd it long before I ever saw one word (I thinke, had heard the name) of *Socinus*; and that the Scripture and Fathers, and other the like means, which taught me all my other Divinity, taught me that too; and saw, that if it were a mistake, it could make no man live worse, (as the contrary opinion might doe, if it were so) I resolved to deny my selfe in that phantase rather

ther then objection; and speak what I thought might edifie what diminution of credit soever it brought after it. I shall addetty thanks for your counsell, which I would faine thinke to bee in great earnest, but that I suppose you cannot beleeeve that I looke upon *Criticisimes* as a kinde of heaven, nor that you would thinke fit to send out in the same breath true Christian earnest, (for above all things, I account admonitions so) and Sarcasmes. I shall onely desire, that I may study the Morall Law, as I finde it delivered from that second Mount: and I will obey you in all other motions, and (as you desire) not censure you for this part of your Sermon, how bitter soever it is, but thank you for all the good you meant by it. But whatever you say of the Morall Lawes perfection, I hope it must not so be understood as to deny that Christ (as hee gave more grace then was ever allowed in the state of nature, or by the Law, so) might, if he pleased, improve the obligations which either the naturall Law, or that given by God through *Moses* had laid on men; and whether by new precepts, or new lights call us to a higher degree of perfection (and oblige us to it) then others had by any particular precept thought themselves obliged to. As for the *imaginary superadditions* you talk of, you will I hope consider, that tis as dangerous to detract from the Word of God, as to adde to it; and to deny Christ to have added, if he have, as to affirme him, if he have not. I am sure, the consequences may be more dangerous. As for your stile of *perfect and spirituall Law*, I shall in the plain word acknowledge it, that it was both perfect (in respect of the state of men to whom it was given, whether by *Moses* to the Jewes, or by the God of nature to all men) and spirituall also, extending to the spirit or soule of man, and not onely to the outward actions. But this, I am perswaded, hinders not but that Christ that gives more grace then was brought into the world by the Law of *Moses* or Nature, and that disburdned all men of that sad yoke that lay on the Jewes, and that is content to accept of sincere without not-sinuing obedience, may have leave to advance his disciples to an higher pitch of spirituall perfection (whether by new laws, or new light) then the Law in the former delivery of it had advanced them: And to set up this pitch, whatever it is, as a precept, (not only a counsell of perfection) to us Christians, was the utmost of my designe and endeavours in that Sermon you speake of 10 years agoe, and is of this Au-

A Copy of some Papers

thor now; and I never imagined it possible that this doctrine could give any man liberty to thinke worse of the Law of God, or practise lesse of it; but have reason to think (and could give an experimentall account of what I say) that the not teaching it, might flatter men ignorantly. to beleieve that there was lesse required of them then I conceive (and desire, they should conceive) there is. And doe you consider also, that hee which is *misogyn*, and most cunningly resists all the restraints that obstruct or undermine his temptations, is *ὁ δὲ δολὸς & ἀνδρῖνος* also; can plead against, accuse, and calumniate any man or doctrines that are contrary to him. And so I humbly take leave of the second report, the Lord forgive you for it.

In the third report it seemes I was not mistaken neither, nor in my expectation, that plaine positive affirming the things you would have affirmed, would not satisfie you. I told you, that the Author under the generall phrase of all kinds and sorts of sinne, sets in the front the weaknesse, frailties, and pollutions of our nature, our pronenesse and inclination to sinne. This your Sermon said was speaking with irresolution, as if he doubted &c. I tell you once againe this is no irresolution; and he doth not doubt but that this aptnesse to fall into all sinne is a sinne, to wit, an aversion of our faculties from God, which ought wholly to be converted to him; will this satisfie you? I have reason from your former carriage not to bee over confident that yet it will; for if it doth, you ought in all reason to have beene satisfied before, where it was set downe as a first *species* of sinne. You say, my expression is inexcusable of [*as infelicities*, if not as *sinnes*,] you, it seemes, are resolv'd it shall not bee excused to you, and therefore will not interpret it by the words that went next before it, or so as it may bee reconciled with them, but will force it to a sense directly contradictory to what went just before it, and so must suppose *me mad* (for so is hee that can affirme contradictions at once) onely because you will not be just; any thing that is most irrationall must bee beleev'd of another man, rather then an expression bee excused by you. But, Sir, I doe not yet thinke it inexcusable, if I desired to bring all those men on their knees (in humiliation and godly sorrow for their inclinations to evill) which doe not beleieve them when they are not consented to, to bee other then infelicities.

Men that will not bee of my opinion in all things, I can bee content to serve and minister unto, and labour to doe them good upon their owne (if they will not permit mee upon my) principles. But then it seemes I must not say, *pollutions of nature* (I said, of *our nature*, and you seldome leave out the least word by chance, or but when you have some designe in it,) or if I doe, that expression is more proper to denote actuall sinnes, then originall sinne, which is one entire, &c. I shall put it to the question, whether *pollutions of our nature* bee at all proper to denote actuall sinnes, which are pollutions of our persons; whether not most proper to our naturall aversions from God, or inclinations to evill: If the wisest or meanest would have that better exprest, I desire to heare from them, and it shall bee considered against another edition, which will againe (after all your triumph on that occasion) stoop to serve the meanest in explaining.

2. For him that (as you say) hath *consented* to the corruption of his nature, that hath cherished and been pleased with it, I shall suppose him to have committed an actuall sinne, and then sure his evill inclination was not the thing which could bee capable of the title of infelicity in any mans sense, for that title supposes positively that they are not consented to. And though every man that is of age hath sometimes so consented, yet sometimes, and in some one act, I shall by Gods grace suppose it possible that he hath not; and then, that his act of non-consenting will bee a peece of Christian victory over that sinfull inclination; and the sinfull inclination, though it shall still continue a sinne, and bee matter of humiliation, yet sure will not passe with you for a sinne cherished at that time, and consented to.

Your third quarrell grounded on the conceit that I seeme to imply, *that there must needs bee some consent given to every actuall sinne*, did make a very hard shift to bee a quarrell; and instead of being managed with blowes, stands still, and falls out into contumelies; and concludes that I should prove, but it selfe ventures not to disprove any thing: otherwise (if I saw your grounds, of scruple) it may possibly bee beleevd, that this Divinity might bee cleared to you, without pretending, as you say, to *Disquisitions*.

4. I doe neither recant what was said before, nor doubt whether *inclinations to sinne bee sinnes*, i. e. averſions from God, and then it matters not what you ſay I ſeeme to doe: I ſaid this before, and ſo I ſay ſtill, and (how humble ſoever the diſlike of your behaviours towards mee may by Gods grace helpe mee to bee) this is not recanting.

5. For the danger, I ſhall acknowledg it, when I acknowledge the thing, but to ſet downe inclinations to ſinne in the front of the *ſpecies* of the generall phraſe [*all ſorts of ſinne*] is not to ſpeak ſceptically. How many ſoever there be that teach otherwiſe, you ſee I am not one of them; And why that Author uſed the word [*if not*,] you have been told ſo oft already, that you could have no excuſe to aſke the reaſon of it againe, but your deſire to lay a new accusation on mee of complying with the *Socinians*: Which Sir is, as your accusation, ſo your calumnie againe, if you meant any other thing by *compliance* then the deſiring more to bring all to humble themſelves before God for their inclinations to ſinne (on what principles ſoever they went) then at that time, in the miſt of a *Practiſall Catechiſme*, in the matter of Repentance, to ſall a diſputing with all commers about originall ſin. For the *Liturgie* you ſpeake of, if you know not my minde, let mee tell you, 1. That I would have the Letany continued in the Church, the firſt part of which is ſufficiently contrary to your [*&c.*] and this you may gueſſe by a Book which I profeſſe to ſubſcribe to in that particular, viz. *The view of the Dir.* page 25, and 26. Then ſecondly, that I would have the *Doxologies* continued, and how that would become ſuch a Liturgie you may ſee, *View of the Dir.* page 32, and 33. yet farther, that I would have the *Creed* continued, yea, and *kneceling at the Sacrament*, among other reaſons for this, (on which the Proteſtants in *Poland* forbade ſitting,) becauſe I would not comply with the ancient or moderne *Arians*, or any other that make our Saviour a meere creature. For which I ſhall direct you alſo to that *View of the Dir.* page 28. I ſhall not now aſke you which is more compliant to your [*&c.*] the New Directory, or Old Liturgie; nor whether a *Socinian* may not more conveniently officiate now (and ſo, in that caſe, thoſe of his opinions joyne with him) then they could fix yeares agoe, when the whole Church ſervice was appointed to bee read conſtantly in every Church. I am not wil-

ling to trouble you with any new questions, but onely to bee satisfied by you in matter of fact what wrong you have done that Author in your Sermons, and to shew you that it is wrong. As for reparations from you, I now know you better then vehemently to expect any, and by your carriage in this particular, and your [*If I were composing such a Liturgie,*] I am for the future arm'd to bee content with what now I finde, and to expect that when you want even words in the Author to cavill at (as it will bee long before those will bee wanting, and I remember to have seen an art of cavilling that turn'd every word of the *Creed* into heresie, or blasphemy, or Atheisme, and then what shall become of this poore mortall fraile Catechisme, when such an artificer is resolved to triumph over it?) possibilities, and jealousies, such as the [*If you were composing, &c.*] shall bee sufficient to rob that Author of his little reputation. That that [*if*] could have no ground but in your designe *quocunque modo* to defame him for a *Socinian*, you will guesse, when againe I tel you that the placing inclinations in the front of sins, was a declaration free and full against that error.

6. I am, you see, neither of their minde that thinke inclination to ill no sinne, nor therefore did I blinde, but instruct my Reader with that *Orthodox expression*, as you call it; and 'tis hard that a man cannot use Orthodox expressions, but he must be accused for doing it, upon supposition that he did it to this end that he might afterwards tempt others to an error. God knowes our hearts, and must onely judge that of me: and till hee have done so, and revealed it to you, 'tis want of charity in you to say I have not done fairely.

7. If it were never so absurd, to say that godly sorrow were to bee conceived for an infelicity *quod sit*, meerly as an infelicity, yet it might bee conceived for it [*as an infelicity if not a sinne;*] &c. by them who doubt whether it bee a sinne or no, or who, though they are not certainly perswaded that it is a sinne, when unconsented to, yet acknowledge it so, when it is consented to, and then grieve for it as for a sinne; and when it is not, acknowledge it to bee an infelicity, and grieve for that also. Besides, an infelicity may bee such an infelicity, that it may be matter of godly sorrow, though not *quod sit*, meerly as an infelicity: as, in this point, I may have sorrow that I have.

have a vitious impure nature about mee, which is justly thought by me an infelicity, especially in comparifon with that pure state of them that are with Christ; and this sorrow is *ἡ γὰρ θεία*, a sorrow according to God; and the interpretation of desiring or loving the appearance of Christ, and so a godly sorrow: and hee that doth not positively resolve that this having a vitious nature is more then a pollution and an infelicity, taking neither of them for a sin, may yet mourne for it *quā* a pollution, not *quā* an infelicity; and make good that he doth so, by professing sincerely, that hee would undergoe any infelicity, on condition to get rid of this pollution. And yet lastly, (which is the onely answer necessary for you to consider to this point) if that which you say is absurd, were so indeed, it would rather prove, that what is called [*an infelicity, if not a sinne*] were indeed a sinne, when 'tis said of if in that very place, that it must be matter of contrition or godly sorrow, then that it is taken to bee no sinne, when 'tis both affirmed to be one, and to bee matter of contrition. If I should say, that I may have sorrow for somewhat that is an infelicity, and call that a godly sorrow, an error this might bee, but I hope not a dangerous one; or if it were, not such an infectious one as to turne every other affirmation of mine into a non-affirmation, or make mee guilty of other errors, of which I professe (and 'tis cleare at that time by other evidences) that I am not guilty. Thus hard is it for flesh and blood to lay downe a quarrell or a jealousy, when 'tis once engaged. Otherwise, plaine words might deserve to bee heeded to prove a man Orthodox, as well as supposed consequences to arraigne publicly, and condemn him for errors. In how much more quietnesse have poore creatures possesse their soules, that have learnt from those words (and ever since dayly practised) the humbling of themselves for their very inclinations to sinne, then you that have thus used your skill unhappily to limbeck, extract, and force poyson out of them?

8. I acknowledge, that every sin ought to bee bewailed as a sin, and that inclinations to sin ought to bee so bewailed; and I meant by contrition, or breaking of the heart to pieces, as much as your *teares of blood* amount to: And of this I neither doubt, nor feare to professe my sense. Yet sure they that doe

not agree with mee in that particular, may be advised to have true griefe and sorrow for them and their own principles.

9. That the corruption of our nature hath speciall influence on our practice, I am as confident, and have considered as ponderingly as you: and this whole Catechisme was designed to obstruct those fountaines, as much as was possible, and to helpe to purifie unto Christ a peculiar people zealous of good works; and according to my best understanding, I designed a scheme that might bee instrumentall to that end: and whatever your method would have been, and what your commands for the particulars that might bee more expresse cleared, I could not divine, and had liberty to use my own method. This onely I know, that inclinations to sin are there expresse to bee sins, and that clearely enough, that hee may discern it who hath so much leisure from quarrelling as to bewaile them. And indeed you need not tell me what dangerous consequences have been inferred from doubtfull expressions in Catechismes, &c. For I have an example before mine eyes of one that will inferre those consequences from one word in such a Booke, that the whole sense of the place contradicts directly, as much as sin and no sin are contradictories, and then 'tis but reason a man were allow'd pardon (and not triumph'd over presently) for being willing (when 'tis by anothers fault become so necessary) to explaine. And so much for the third report.

The fourth (*that about faiths being, whether a condition, or instrument of Justification:*) I cannot observe by your words that you have at all insisted on in either assembly; for though you deny it not, yet also you affirme nothing, as in the two former, which you owne; and as in the last you are pleased to doe. Either then you spake to this particular, and then although it bee a fault in you not to acknowledge it, yet till I am sure of it, and that my reputation is concerned in it, I have no reason farther to importune you; or else you did not speake to it, and consequently did mee no injury in that particular, and then I truly cannot accuse you, having no authority that you did, worth my depending on, and that which I had, contradicted by others, as the other of the Trinity which proved untrue, and so the rather inclines mee to believe that this is so also: On these grounds I have no temptation to adde more to this
G matter,

matter, because the whole businesse which brought us now together, was to vindicate my selfe from (and that made it necessary for me to know what had been) your accusations, and not to render you at this time (which I can spend much more profitably to my selfe and others) an account of my faith, save onely where you have calumniated it. Yet because it is possible that the questions here proposed by you, may through some mistake or ignorance of the grounds that I goe on, bee matter of some scruple to you, and it may bee my duty to prevent those mistakings, I have now thought fit to tell you, what is the generall ground that I build on in this matter, by analogy to which you may forme an answer to those questions, and reconcile those seeming differences which you may have taken notice of. My grounds are these, 1 That justification is divine acceptance, and pardon of sin. 2 That the mercy of God, through the satisfaction and merits of Christ, is the sole cause of this justification. 3 This worke of justification is of such a nature, consisting meerly in Gods pronouncing us just, accepting and pardoning, a worke of God without us, upon us, concerning us, but not within us, that consequently nothing within us can have any reall proper efficiency in this worke: for then that, whatever it is, must bee said to justifie, *i. e.* to accept, and pardon, which nothing in us can be said to doe, though but *minus principaliter, secundario, or realiter instrumentaliter*; for if it had any such efficiency, there might in strict speaking be some reall vertue or force in that thing, and that proportionable to the effect in some measure, at least it must act *virtute prima cause*, and by the impulsion of that might immediately produce the effect; which any even grace, as it is in us, hath not force enough to doe. For either it must doe it as an inferiour meritorious cause, subordinate to Christs merits, or as an inferiour efficient cause, subordinate to Gods pardoning and accepting; and then, as I said, that must pardon and accept also immediately, though not principally; as the knife cuts immediately, though the hand or the man principally. 4 This work of grace in God through Christ thus justifying, is not every mans portion, some qualification or condition there is required in the subject, in the person whose finnes God will thus pardon in Christ, or without which God that justifies the sinner, will not yet

yet justifie the impenitent infidell : the promises of God, though generall, being yet conditionall promises, and the promise of pardon being one of them, as shall be proved at large if you thinke fit. 5 This condition is set downe in severall phrases in the Scripture, Conversion, Repentance, Regeneration, but especially receiving of Christ, faith in the heart, an embracing of Christ, the whole Christ, taking him as our Priest, whose sacrifice, and whose intercession to depend on; as our King, whose throne to bee set up in our hearts; as our Prophet, to submit our understandings to his doctrines, and captivate them to the obedience of faith. 6 This grace of faith hath many excellent offices and efficiencies; one principall one, laying hold on the promises, laying hold on the *Λύτρον*; others also of subduing the passions, mortifying lusts, overcoming the world. In all these, being workes wrought in us, by God principally, instrumentally by this grace, Faith is an efficient. But all this doth not at all conclude it to bee in any propriety of speech an efficient, or any kinde of logicall proper cause in the act of justification: because there is no need of any such, God being ready to doe his worke, to performe his promise, *i. e.* to justifie the penitent beleever; and whensoever by his grace that qualification is wrought in the heart, or there but truly rooted, God pronounces that man just.

I have out of my heart set downe my sense, which I suppose, you will finde every where scattered in the Booke. I desire not that it may prove a *μῦθον* *ῥεῖσθαι* between us, (in case there bee any word hastily let fall, which though to mee, that understood my owne meaning, it bee plaine, to you, especially if you delight to bee captious, may want explication;) but yet I would bee glad to heare, if there bee any poyson in any of these propositions; and whether, and wherein I am mistaken: If not, I suppose you will be able to answer all your twelve *queries* out of these premises, or discern that it was impertinent to aske them, these grounds being thus supposed. I shall I think, onely need to adde, that as soone as ever this new creature hath life in him, at the first cordiall receiving the whole Christ in vow, or resolution sincere, *i. e.* at the first minute of conversion thus to God, the person is justified; not one of those in time after the other, but in order of nature, as

naturally the condition must be undertaken, before the Covenant belongs to mee: but at what minute soever this is done, God puts away his wickednesse, &c. *I have sinned*, saith David, and *the Lord hath put away thy sinne*, saith Nathan; *I said I have sinned unto the Lord, and thou puttest away the iniquity of my sinne*. This thus pre-required I call sanctification *in semine*, or *ἀναγωγῆς*, (the direct Greeke for that word) *without which no man shall see God*; and consequently, without which no man is justified; for whosoever is so, is in that condition at that minute, that, if hee dye in it, hee cannot misse of glory. Beside this notion of sanctification: there is another for the acts, and fruits, and state of sanctification: and that I acknowledge a consequent of justification, and an effect of that grace that justifieth the ungodly. And having added this, I conceive I have clear'd the way to your last particular.

In which, it seemes, you tooke some exceptions, which, by what hath been said, will appeare to bee your fault, not the Authors of the Catechisme. For 1 faith and workes are not confounded in the discourse of justification, any otherwise then St. James and St. Paul confound them; St. Paul saying, *Abraham was justified by faith*, and St. James by workes, and the way of the reconciling them punctually set downe there. 2 What hee doth say of being justified by faithfull actions, as it is after the very stile of St. James [*Abraham was justified by workes*]; so doth the word [*by*] signifie onely a condition, not an efficient. And whereas you mention obedience to the whole Gospel, constellation of Gospel-graces, &c. and thinke strange that they should bee affirmed the condition of justification, you must remember that those phrases denote them onely in the seed, or first life of all these proportionably to the first notion of sanctification, and then I suppose you can make no scruple of that affirmation. 3 You scruple that faith without the addition of such workes, such obedience Evangelicall, would bee affirmed unsufficient to justification. Wherein perhaps you thinke [*workes*] signifies actuall performances: but that is not the meaning of it in that place, but the word is taken in another Scripture-acceptation of it, for such obedience as the Gospel now requires, and for that which the Story of Abraham once makes the thing on which hee was justified, &c.

resolution to obey God in the sacrificing his Son, not the actual sacrificing of him: this is there called in the *Catech.* page 35. Evangelicall obedience, and is set as the explication of workes; and without this, I acknowledge to beleve that faith would bee insufficient to justifie; meaning faith in any other notion but that which doth containe this receiving him as a King, and giving up the obedience of the heart to him. And you must give mee leave a little to wonder why you should add, that the words following (in that place) are as bad or worse then the former, (and yet 'twas but civility and prudence not to name them) when they are but a direct citation of a place of Scripture. Thus [the same is called in a parallel place, *Faith consummate by love, Gal. 5. 6.*] (for so the Greek *ἡ ἀγάπη* is rendred by the *Syriack*.) The truth is, the last thing by you excepted against, was in effect a place of Scripture also, *1. Jan. 2. 22.* [*Faith made perfect by workes,*] set downe in some words of paraphrase; and then this in the *Galatians* might be as bad or worse then that, (I shall mollifie the harsh phrase for you, and adde) more contrary to the *Antinomians* and *Fiduciarists*. As for your disproving that doctrine, I shall not need consider that, because the doctrine is new set when it comes to be disproved, and in those termes which you see I acknowledge not: for I doe not suppose the necessity of adding Evangelicall workes unto that purpose, and in that act, to make faith the instrument of justification. For 1. I acknowledge not faith an instrument of that, any other then a morall instrument, by which I expresse my selfe to meane a condition accepted by God to justification; and a logicall or proper instrument of receiving Christ, (which Christ, not which Faith, justifies.) 2. Evangelicall workes, in the notion wherein I surpose you now take them, for fruits of faith, performances of obedience, I affirme not to be either instrument or condition in the act of justification, or to that purpose; but I require them afterwards when occasions and opportunities of exercising that faith, of performing those resolutions, doe call for them. And therefore 3. I make no scruple to acknowledge that wee are not justified by any righteousness inherent in us, as I oft have said, but onely by the righteousness of Christ imputed. Only that infusion of new righteousness (which when tis infused and rooted,

is inherent in us) is the condition without which we shall not be justified; not taking it againe for the actual performances, or acts of righteousness. Yet in the three last lines you have now againe changed your question, and made it such an one, that I cannot blame you not to be ashamed to repeat your arguments, or to maintain; For I shall most joyfully conclude with you in the very words, the truth of that you say you used those arguments to prove, *viz. That wee are justified by the obedience of Christ alone, freely imputed by God, applyed and rested on by Faith onely.* For whatever other qualifications be required as conditions in the subject, 'tis the worke onely of faith to apply in that sense, *i. e.* to rest on Christ. And having so well agreed in the conclusion, one would wonder how wee should so differ in the premises. Certainly there was some fault some where. Was not it a willingness to find faults in that Book that made it appeare so full of errors, and a heat (that might have been spared) which turned the pulpit into a *Pasquin*, or *Morforius*, on which that Author was to be defamed?

That which I have now affirmed, I am confident is the summe of what is said on that Point in more words, and with more proofes and clearings in that Catechisme; and not now minced or drest anew by your directions, or for your palate. Yet if it may now please you, and you will ask God forgiveness for your flandering of me, and consider me so much, as to think that that reputation was valuable to the Author which you unjustly laboured to rob him of, I shall most heartily (as I do already forgive you the injury, so) conclude this Paper, and take leave of you, and continue

Munday night, Oct. 19.

1646.

Your Servant

H. Hammond.

*I desire to heare what opinion you have
of this large trouble, thus unexpectedly
multiplied upon my hands.*

Sir,

S I R,

I Am sent for away from hence in great haste to my deare Mother, who is very sicke, and so am forced to dictate to an ill *Amanuensis*; if greater Letters then an e bee mistaken I must crave your pardon. If you thinke fit to reply, be pleased to seale up your notes, and Mr. *Wilkinson* (who lodges at *Merton Colledge*) will convey them to

Ottob. 30. 1646.

Your Servant

Fr. Cheynell.

S I R,

I Conceive your Letters are meant, (as they are by the superscription directed) to mee onely: yet I thought it my duty to direct you to some that are equally ingaged, and able to give you better satisfaction. You will not beleeeve mee, and I have done. As for your discourse about desiring an exact account, truly Sir, I doe seriously beleeeve, that when you were at highest, you would shew as much civility towards any Minister of Christ, as you did towards mee. It may stand with the state of an Arch-deacon to desire an account, if hee adde, exact account. The greatest Generall will give Orders to his Officers in as homble a stile; These are to desire. But enough, if not too much of that. If your challenge made mee smile gravely, yet sure you are too angry when you say, I have reproached and slandered you; you endeavour to make mee as happy, as you conceive your selfe to bee. Sir, I never thought that there had been so much advantage to bee made of a Parenthesis; I doe not desire to mistake your meaning, and am sorry to read your uncharitableness. Your judgement is, that I seeke for nothing in your Papers but exceptions; you intimate that I am no Scholar, and to your selfe no friend; yet you are so courteous as to com-

communicate some part of your mind to your unlearned enemy : but you professe, that you doe not cast up a ball of new contention between us, onely you are pleased to referre mee to another Book called the *View of the new Directory*.

I acknowledge that I have heard, what I now begin to beleieve, that that Book is yours, because you smile upon it, as Fathers use to do upon their pretty Babes.

The Author of that view of the new Directory layes downe this rule, page 2. [*Nothing is necessary in the worship of God, but what God hath prescribed ;*] Pray, Sir, let us know how many severalls of the Common-prayer-book that are purposely left out in the Directory, are prescribed by God.

2 The said Author abuses both Presbyterians and Independents ; but whether hee doth answer the severall Arguments propounded by either, I leave to you to consider. Sir, if you have any thing to say against our Learned and Reverend brethren of *Scotland*, they are of age to answer you, try their strength.

3 If you please to undertake the answer of Mr. Cottons arguments against set Formes, you may have liberty to speake your minde ; but truly Sir, till you have performed this taske (I mean, till you have shewen how many things are prescribed by God, and rejected by us in this Directory: 2 Till you have answered our brethren of *Scotland*, and Mr. Cotton, (to say nothing of others) you have no temptation to triumph, unlesse you meane to triumph before the victory, as that Author doth. You should not refer us to Mr. Hooker, now the state of the question is so much varied.

4 If it bee granted to you, that some set Forme may, by some persons, at least for some time, bee lawfully used ; how will you prove it necessary that any whole entire set Platforme of Liturgie should bee rigorously imposed upon all the Ministers of these three Kingdomes of *England*, &c? is not that the thing which you doe so passionately long after, and earnestly contend for? if it be not, I confesse I am much mistaken ; and if it be, let it be clearly and undeniably proved.

5 In this last returne, I doe not finde you willing to owne what your words seemed to import, [*That there is some necessity, that the Liturgy formed in the Apostles times should bee continued*

in the Church.] For you give the present Church leave to judge of the Liturgy composed in the time of the Apostles (as you pretend) and to make what alterations or additions, alienation or exchange shall seeme fit to the present Church. But Sir, if those Apostolicall men were extraordinarily assisted by the Spirit in composing that Liturgy, shall men of ordinary gifts take upon them to passe a peremptory sentence for altering, alienating, exchanging what was (as you conceive) composed by the extraordinary assistance of the Spirit, and is by a more then ordinary blessing and providence preserved and transmitted to posterity? Sir, take your words according to your owne interpretation, that the holy Ghost who settled a Ministry, enabled them in the Apostles time to forme a Liturgy to continue in the Church, to the end that the Ministers might pray and intercede for their severall Congregations; and you doe certainly decline, if not studiously, the maintaining of what you are engaged to maintain by your *View of the Directory*; if a Minister may pray as hee ought in a congregation, without the use of the Liturgy, which you say was formed in the Apostles time to continue in the Church, then sure a Minister may pray as hee ought in the Congregation, without the helpe of the late Common-prayer-book.

6 You name severall Liturgies; which will you stand to, and avouch that it is without any interpolation or corruption?

7 Not to spend time about the miraculous gift of prayer, you say there were some exercises of that gift, and confesse those exercises to bee different from the set Formes you contend for. Sir, is there no ordinary gift of Prayer vouchsafed to the Ministers of Christ? should not this ordinary gift be stirred up by meditation, and exercised in prayer? should not Ministers of Christ give themselves to pray, and study how to pray seasonably, according to the severall occasions administred by the various turnes of Gods providence? How doe you prove, that a man that hath not ordinary wisdom to pray as hee ought, is called by Christ to bee a Minister of the Gospel? Surely Sir, I thinke a Minister should study to pray seasonably, as well as preach seasonably, and if the Primitive method and manner of prayer bee to bee observed, it doth not follow that the Liturgies, which goe under the name of *St. James* and *Marks*, and have con-

stantly been suspected by Learned men, should be rigorously imposed upon the Ministers of the New Testament, who have an ordinary gift of prayer, nay, are indued with the spirit of prayer.

8 You mention the use of Psalmes, and the Lords prayer. Why sure Sir, you did view the Directory very slightly, if you tooke no notice of the Order about the publique reading of the holy Scriptures, and the frequent reading of the Book of *Psalmes*. Wee acknowledge the prayer which Christ taught his Disciples to bee of it selfe a most comprehensive prayer, and not onely a patterne of prayer; And it is specially recommended to bee used in the prayers of the Church; if you please to call this a Liturgy (and, it seemes, you can demonstrate no more) doe not complaine that you are deprived of all manner of Liturgy; for now you have told me that *publique divine Service* is the English of *Liturgy*. Sure I am, the Parliament desires that our publique service of God should be most divine and orderly; for their care hath been to hold forth such things as are of divine institution in every Ordinance, and to set forth other things according to the rules of Christian prudence, agreeable to the generall rules of the Word of God: and for the consent and harmony of the Churches, there are generall heads propounded, and if you observe the generall heads, the sense and scope of the prayers, and other parts of publique worship, you will have no cause to complaine of disorder and confusion in our publique worship. But you tell mee that wee may pray as we ought, without the helpe of that Liturgy, which you conceive was formed in the Apostles time; and therefore I thinke I may proceed to the sadder part of your task.

2 Concerning your sad Story, I need say no more, but that I am glad you have disabused one offender, I could wish that you would disabuse all those whom you have abused with three or foure editions of your Booke, by a remarkable Recantation of your error. Sir, venture my arguments to any Reader, I feare none; let your Book bee witnesse whether I charge you justly or no: I meane your Book printed at *Oxford*, and all printed after that Copy; I except nothing, but your lesse remarkable alteration, which was not remarkable enough for mee to take notice of in so short a time; and therefore you must
blame

blame your selfe, that your Recantation was no more remarkable; for when you told mee that you added these words [*In the primary intention of the phrase.*] I looked over your additions more heedfully, and could not finde it: and I did at last read even your lesse remarkable alterations, and the Printers Postscript, or yours, for the excuse of your selfe and him.

Sir, your first answer in the eighth Section of your Catechisme, explains the meaning of the third Commandement to be according to the literall sound, against perjury or non-performance of promissory oaths; mark that [*Promissory oaths.*] Whereupon your Scholar is immediately prompted to aske whether the third Commandement, [*Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine,*] bee no more (marke that, *no more*) then [*thou shalt not forswear thy selfe?*] your answer is, *No more undonbredly.* The God of heaven judge between us; nay, your severall editions do judge; there being not a syllable of the primary intention to be found in three or four editions.

2 I say, the question is, what is meant in the third Commandement? Your first answer being an explication of the meaning of the Commandement: The second question is, whether the third Commandement bee *no more*? that is, whether the meaning of it be no more, then that thou shalt not forswear thy self? this is most cleare to mee.

3 The question is not of the intention of a phrase; that's but a harsh expression, which must bee explained to bee meant of the intention of the Law-giver; and it was Gods intention to forbid foolish and wanton swearing, as well as forswearing.

4 Wee had not best dispute what is primary and secundary in Gods intention; one intention is sufficient, and that is to forbid both.

5 You are not able to make it good that that's the primary intention of the phrase: and therefore I glanced at that by the way.

6 Your doubtfull *perhaps* was that which troubled mee: and surely Sir, you doe see what reason you have to blot out *perhaps*.

7 Why doe you say, *perhaps foolish and wanton, sure prophane* using of Gods Name is forbidden? is it not as sure that foolish and wanton using of Gods Name is forbidden as prophane using

of it? or is not all foolish and wanton using of Gods name prophane?

8 Your remarkable alterations assure mee, that you are convinced that you had not said enough against vaine assertory oaths, in any of your editions: for the words run thus in them all, the particular matter of *Moses* his Law, [*was of promissory* (not assertory) *oaths,*] which you alter thus, [*peculiarly of promissory, not only of assertory oaths:*] and if that be not a recantation, I doe not know what a recantation meanes.

9 I said truly that a doubtfull *perhaps* would not restrain youths from foolish and wanton using of the Name of God; if Preachers bee so timerous to cry, Perhaps it is forbidden, and that but by reduction neither, swearers will grow bold. I doe not like your instance in this last Paper, when you say, that fornication is forbidden in the seventh Commandement by reduction; surely Sir, there needs no reduction to evince that fornication is forbidden.

10 You talke of the words of the Commandement; the question is, of the meaning of God in the Commandement. Gods mind is to forbid foolish swearing in the third Commandement, and fornication in the seventh.

11 I did not take notice of your argument to prove that forswearing is forbidden in the third Commandement, because you prove what I never denied.

12 You say, the Oath which you take lawfully in Judicature, may come from the Devill in another. You are mistaken; it is not the oath, but the vanity of the oath which comes from the Devill.

13 You come not off with honour, when you say, First, that the superaddition (which I call imaginary) is a command of Christ, and afterwards say, if it was not a superaddition by a new precept, yet there is a superaddition of new light. Your Catechisme is, it seemes, like the Tridentine Canons, capable not onely of severall but contrary interpretations. I appeale to your Booke againe, *Lib. 2. Sect. 3. page 93.* First, your interpretation that Christ came to fill up the Law, as a vessell that had some water in it before, but now is filled up to the brim; and that which is worse, of a picture, &c. Sir, was there but a rude draught of morall perfection in the perfect Law of God? was

it drawne in colors to the life, or as it were with a coale? Take heed, bee not too busie in imitating any Father in a dangerous expression, or in excusing the great evacuators of the Law. Secondly, though you pretend often to bee very carelesse whether you prove a superaddition or improvement of the Law to have been made by Christ, yet you confesse that it is the foundation of a weighty superstructure, *page 94*. Pray Sir, declare what that superstructure is. Is it that you may be justified by obedience to these new superadded precepts, and yet say that you are justified by a righteousness without the Law? say honestly, is that the superstructure, or is it not? 3 Doe you not tell us, that *light is the state and doctrine of Christianity, darkness of sinne and imperfection*? observe how untowardly that comparison runs; though you do not bring it round, yet you goe too farre; you say, that before Christ, there was some mixture of imperfection, and some vacuities in the Commandements of God; you are speaking of the morall Law; you say, *These vacuities are filled by Christ, page 94*. These expressions sure have reference to new precepts, and not onely to new light; if not, read *page 96*. to shew that Christ came to *fill up the Law*, say you; first hee rehearseth the old Law, and thereby confirms it, and then annexes his new Law to it. What say you, who is blindfold now? is not this undeniable? 4 You speak too doubtfully, *page 95*. when you say, that Christ under the Gospel gives *higher or plainer promises*: you should speak with more resolution in a Practicall Catechisme. 1 There was Gospel under the Law, and the Spirit was ministred to all the elect then, during the time of legall administrations; divers Jewes were penitent beleivers, and therefore under the second Covenant before Christ came in the flesh. 2 The promises were plaine enough to them that were endued with the Spirit, as is evident by the Apostles discourse in the 11 Chap. to the *Hebrewes*, they were so plaine that they saw them, were perswaded of them, and embraced them; though the thing promised, the Incarnation of Christ, was farre off, yet their light was so cleare, and eye of faith so strong, that they beheld Christ as farre off. 3 Wee have no higher promise then that of being heires and co-heires with Christ in glory, and they had the promise of eternall life, the promise of being blessed for ever in Jesus Christ. 4 The ceremonies which you

say had nothing good in them, did direct to Christ, and therefore there was this good in them, that they did by Gods ordinance and blessing direct the elect of God under that dispensation unto Christ, in whom they were to enjoy all-sufficient and everlasting good things in glory. 5 No sinne was able actually to damne penitent beleevvers during the time of legall administrations. And therefore I wonder at your discourse in the 95. page. Pray Sir, is there any veniall sinne? 6 You speake too faintly, when you call the Evangelicall discoveries before Christ, glimmerings of light, and insert the scepticall *perhaps*, page 95. of your Pract. Catech. Sir, there is no *perhaps*, no hap-hazard in this businesse; Jesus Christ was sufficiently discovered during the time of Leviticall administrations to all the elect for their everlasting salvation. 7 When you speake of the glimmerings of the Gospel, you say these things were not universally commanded to all under threat of eternall punishment, but onely recommended to them that will doe that which is best, and so see good dayes, &c. Observe 1 That you doe here by consequence asserť, that there were counsells of perfection under the Law: I will not say workes of supererogation, but the Jewes were (it seems) encouraged to doe somewhat more then was commanded. 2 Will you say, that to beleieve in the promised seed, to circumcise their hearts, mortifie their lusts, reforme their lives, walke in new obedience, was more then was commanded in the time of the Leviticall dispensation? 3 Will you say, that the Jewes were not obliged to beleieve in the promised seed, circumcise their hearts, and the like, under threat of eternall punishment? I might enlarge, but by your answer to these few proposalls, I shall be able to understand your obscure Catechisme; doe not say, that there is a Sarcasme in the Epithet. I hope, you will now confesse that you did contend for *new precepts*; and therefore you recant once more, if you will bee satisfied with *new light*. Sir, counsells give new light, but you say the superadditions in the fifth of *Matthem* are all commands, and not counsells onely; and you endeavour to prove it *ex praesuppositis*, page 96. Surely the same things were commanded of old; then these are but imaginary superadditions, as I called them: but if they bee superadditions, and not onely counsells but commands; they are new precepts, and therefore you did not contend for new light onely,

onely, but for new precepts. By this little that hath been said, it is cleare that you had some weighty superstructure to lay upon this ample foundation of new precepts, or else you did but sweat and toyle in laying the foundation that you might have your labour for your paines, which you are too wise to doe. *Sic notus Ulysses?*

All that I desire is, that you would alter from worse to better; for I joyne with you in professing that such an alteration doth declare amiable and imitable qualities. Finally, if you contend not for new precepts, then acknowledge that the super-additions you dreamt of were, as I said, imaginary; and I must remember you that the third Commandement, which is out of question the command of God, and Christ, and the holy Ghost, will by Gods blessing bee most prevalent to restraints men from foolish or wanton using of the name of God in assertory oaths, or any other idle using of Gods name when they doe not sweare. What I said of Criticisms was no Sarcastime: I did but remember you that Critiques are apt to thinke themselves so farre above other men, that they doe usually contemne the serious admonitions of poore Countrey Preachers. But as high as the Critiques thinke themselves, I hoped that you would not thinke them mounted to the highest heaven, and therefore called it a lower heaven.

You tell mee, [*That you doe onely desire to study the morall Law, as you finde it delivered from the second Mount*] in your last return, page 14. So say the men whom you cry out upon, the *Antinomians*; and they give this for a reason, because the Law of God published on mount *Sinai* doth not in their opinion oblige believers.

But you goe beyond them in the next page, pag. 15. and imply, that no unbeliever is obliged under paine of damnation, to observe the morall Law. Your words are to this effect, [*That Christ, who gives more grace then was brought into the world by the Law of Moses or nature, hath disburdened all men of that sad yoke that lay on the Jewes, and is content to accept of sincere, without not-sinners obedience.*]

1 I desire to know what grace was brought into the world by the Law of *Moses*? Doth not the Apostle say that grace came not by *Moses*, but by Christ onely? 2 How doe you prove that all

all men, I meane, every one of mankinde, is put under the second Covenant? I suppose that is your meaning, because in your Pract. Catech. page 5. you affirme [*That Christ did satisfie for all the sinnes of all mankinde, and that all other parts of the second Covenant are consequent and dependent on that*] And therefore I conceive that in your opinion there is a revelation of the Law of faith made, a pardon granted, and sufficient grace given to every one of mankinde to performe what is necessary now under the second Covenant; because you acknowledge that these are mercies made over in *Christ* by the second Covenant, in the selfe same page; and to whom are the mercies made over, but to them for whose sinnes Christ hath satisfied? 3 I desire to know how Christ could disburthen any man, or satisfie for the sinnes of any one, according to your opinion, if he did onely exercise the office of an Aaronicall Priest by his sacrifice? For it is certain that no Aaronicall Priest did ever make any more then a Typicall satisfaction by the exercise of his office; and you adde, that when the Scripture speaketh indefinitely of Christs Priesthood, or his eternall Priesthood, or of his blessing us and turning of us from our iniquities, these expressions have no reference to his [*single, finite, unrepeatd sacrifice upon the crosse, which belongs to his Aaronicall Priesthood,*] but they must be understood of his Melchisedechian Priesthood, to which hee was consecrated by his death, which you terme an Aaronicall sacrifice, and looke upon it as a rite and ceremony for the consecrating of Christ to be our eternall High-priest, page 17, 18, 19. You think you have gone farre beyond the Socinians in this point; but heare what Smalcus saith, *Non est autem dissimulandum nos non negare Christi mortem ad ejus sacrificium pertinere*, Refutat. Smiglec. de erroribus nov. Arianorum, lib. 2. pag. 282. a word is enough to a wise man. Our case stands thus then, 1 Your doubtfull perhaps will not restraine men from foolish wanton swearing; you did well to blot out that. 2 Your new precepts will not doe it, and you doe well to rest satisfied without them. 3 Your totall prohibition of swearing it selfe will not doe the deed; because Christ doth onely prohibit false swearing and vaine swearing, he doth not prohibit swearing it selfe; for if swearing it selfe were prohibited, it would never be lawfull to sweare in any case; even as adultery it selfe is prohibited, and therefore it is not lawfull to commit adultery in any case.

I hope you will distinguish between vaine swearing, and swearing it selfe; if swearing it selfe bee prohibited, I must not swear for the publique good, because I must not doe any thing that is prohibited, though it tend to the publique good. You wonder to heare me speake of *Smalcus*, and demand who is not of that opinion? Sir, remember that you say, [*Christ hath superadded to the old Commandement a totall universall prohibition of swearing it selfe, making that as unlawfull now, as perjury was before.*] pag. 120. Now for a man that maintaines this, to say likewise that it is lawfull to swear for the publique good, is to speak like *Smalcus*, &c. Examine well whether you be not guilty of the sinne of dogmatizing: for I know if you did not condescend too passively to take up both opinions, you have reason enough to discern that these opinions do fight with one another. Sir, I have proved it already; take one argument more. If swearing it selfe be as unlawfull now, as perjury was before Christ came in the flesh, then it is as unlawfull to swear for the publique good, as for a man to forswear himselfe for the publique good, which I hope you will not affirme. A man may be lawfully called to swear, but no man can be lawfully called to forswear himselfe; *Ergo* swearing it selfe is not as unlawfull as perjury. If you wonder that rational men should contradict themselves, I answer they seldom doe it but upon a designe; and I could easily guesse at the designe, but you have taught me to be more reserved.

In the 12 page of your last Answer, you say, *That what is forbidden by reduction is not so deeply obliging*; and therefore I stumble at your notion of reduction, considering that you say, *Fornication is forbidden by reduction in the seventh Commandement*. Sir, I thinke my selfe as deeply obliged to abstaine from fornication as from adultery, I meane, by the same Authority. Moreover you plead there, that Christ may bee said to have added to the third Commandement, because he forbids swearing by any thing else as well as by God. Were men at liberty before Christ came to swear by any creature? Wee may now in some cases swear by God, but in no case by the creature; and therefore swearing by God is not totally and universally forbidden, as swearing by the creature is. You tell mee that *Schmidius* is as venerable an Author as *Paganius*; truly Sir, I am not ashamed to professe that I have promised by that edition of *Paganius*

Pagnine which *Mercer* put forth. If you conceive *Grotius* more venerable than *Mercer*, hee will assure you that *NIV proprie significat vanum*. *R. Isaac Abarbanel* on the 20 of *Exod.* saith, the word is taken so largely in the third Commandement as to comprehend both vaine and false oaths. If I had said, false oaths had not been prohibited in the third Commandement, I would have considered your argument drawne from the signification of the word in the ninth Commandement. If you please to consult *R. David Kimchi in libro Radicum*, hee will prove by the *Talmud Jerusalem.* and *Onkelos*, that the word signifies *frustra*, & *sine causa*; and that hee who sweareth that figs are figs, is to bee punished for swearing in vaine; hee cites the 1 *Sam.* 25. 21. to prove that the word signifies *vaine*, [surely in vaine have I kept.] *David* doth not say hee kept *Nabals* cattle *fallacy*, but in *vaine*; nay, you will finde, that they tell you that a false oath is forbidden, because what is false is vanity, and *Tabu*, and nothing. I cited *R. Abraham Aben-Ezra* on the the third Commandement; and he will tell you, that one that hath accustomed himselfe to swear vainly, will swear in one day oaths without number; and if you reprove him for swearing, hee will swear that hee did not swear, and much more to this purpose. See *R. Salomon Jarchi*, if you please; you will finde, they all come to this, *non assumes nomen Domini gratis, frustra, in vanum*; and therefore you need not reject, what was humbly tendered to you, with so much scorn and indignation. You say, by [would be forbidden] you did in effect meane were forbidden. I doe not understand what you meane, when you say you did in effect meane it: but let that passe, I understand you better when you talke of *id est*, & *id est*: I forgive you; and if that be part of your Rhetorique, I doe not envie you, and will not imitate you.

I passe on to your scanning of the third Repox. 1. Sir, if you did not doubt, you did ill to speake doubtfully; for your doubtful expressions may helpe to make or keepe others doubtfull. You acknowledge something worse then this; I charged you with, namely that you used that expression to serve them, [who make our nation a government from God, and inclinacion to all sinne, to see us sinne, but an infelicitie, unless all nally our sinne] by labouring to doe them good upon their owne principles. Sir, men cannot bee brought to true repentance upon false principles; if mens principles

principles are corrupt, refute their principles, and instruct them better, that they may bee better principled; Otherwise if you build upon a false foundation, your building cannot stand, and they will be hardened in their impenitence by your conviction. Be pleased to take notice, that this corrupt opinion is not a fault-abasing principle, but rather a false, exalting error; and therefore the pressing of such a principle upon them, will never humble them. If you had told them, that we are all by nature spiritually dead, in a polluted and cursed condition, this might humble them; but if you serve men upon their owne proud principles, they will take it for granted that their principles are good, and grow the prouder. No man can conceive true godly sorrow for his actuall sinnes, who doth deny the very root and fountaine of all his sinnes to be a sin.

3 You suppose, that corruption is not cherished in some act, and conclude, *ergo*, in that act it is not cherished; just *idem per idem*.

4 You are desired to prove what you take for granted: is not that equall? I say, that originall sinne is truly and properly a sinne in them that are not of age to consent to it; and that every actuall sin in men of ripe yeares, is not actually and formally consented to; corruption is so strong in us, that it doth many times breake forth without our consent; and I am ready to prove both propositions, if you doubt of them.

5 You were ill advised to passe a complement in a Practicall Catechisme, with men of corrupt opinions, contrary to your owne principles.

6 You mention the *Socinians* very often; but let me intreat you to be wiser: do not provoke me to make a parallel between your expressions and theirs. I take not upon me to know any mans opinion, or his heart, any further then his words declare both.

7 When I spake of a Liturgy that was in designe, you know I did not meane the Common-prayer-book.

8 For your *View of the Directory*, doe not magnifie it till you have finished your taske; never talke of the suffrages of the Jewes, Heathens, or Mahometans, but speake to the point; I have shewen you the point in question.

9 You would have *Doxologies* and *Creds*: is this worth answering? doth not the Directory take in the whole Scripture for a Liturgy? and are there not *Doxologies* enough and *Cred* enough (even all things necessary to salvation) in the holy Scripture? When the confession of faith is published to the world, you will finde this Reverend Assembly (so much scorn'd in that Booke you subscribe to) bee no enemies to any Ortho-

A Copy of some Papers

dox Creed: and you may, amongst the rules and directions about the Sacrament, in the Ordinance of Octob. 20. 1645. see that wee have not forgot our Creed. 10 I am not at leisure to dispute with you about sitting at Sacrament; the Parliament is not guilty of your illogicall conclusions, though you would faine expose them to contempt in your *View of the Directory*, *View Dir.ca. 1. p. 1.* If it please you, we will put it to the question, Whether the Directory (in which there is the wisdom of two Parliaments, two Assemblies, which I oppose to your wisdom) or your Pract. Catechisme give more countenance to Socinian errors and practises? I will dispute this question with you where you please, and when you please. 11 Shew mee where the Directory doth enjoyne all communicants to sit in the act of receiving. 2 Tell mee whether all familiarity with Jesus Christ doth inferre an equality. 3 Doth any Socinian thinke himselfe equall with Christ, or conceive that there is no more honour due to Christ, then to a meere man? Pray, doe the Socinians no wrong, they will say as you say, That Christ did not blesse us till after his resurrection, till hee became an everlasting Priest; and ever since he was such a Priest, hee hath all power in heaven and earth, a power equall to Gods power, and therefore Divine honour is due to him. *Sed tum cultum qui nunc Christo debetur postquam in coelis esse cepit, qui est, ut ipsi tanquam Deo confidamus, & omnia ab illo speremus, & petamus quae ad salutem eternam pertinent, adeoque ipsam eternam salutem dicimus ei deberi, non propter qualemcunque, sed talem & tantam potestatem quae par sit Dei potestati, Smalcus refutat. prim. lib. Smig. de erroribus Arianorum, cap. 11. p. 109.* Sir, I will give you a better Argument against the Directory, and for the Common prayer-booke; you may read it, *View of the Directory*, page 27 [*It is not necessary to exchange the pleasant easie course of our Liturgy, for the tedious, joylesse, lesse-profitable course in the Directory.*] Tell Prelates and Courtiers of ease and pleasure, and you winne their hearts. This was a good Argument for an University Orator to urge, but this same word *Ergo* spoiles all such Rhetoricall arguments. I hasten to your discourse about godly sorrow: This is your first assertion. 1 Godly sorrow may be conceived for the pollutions of our nature, as infelicities, if not as sinnes. Be pleased to prove this proposition; and I will abide by it, and maintaine the negative. 2 *Hee which doubts whether originall*

sinne

finne bee a sinne, may conceive godly sorrow for it, this is the second dictate. But your third Dictate is admirable. 3 *He that thinks inclination to sinne no sinne, but when he actually consents to it, may when hee doth not consent to it, grieve for it as an infelicity.* Sir, the question is of Godly sorrow: is it godly sorrow, or is it not, for a man, to grieve for an infelicity, which, as he conceives, is no way sinfull? 4 You say, *If a man look upon originall sin as a pollution, though not as a sinne, hee may grieve for it with a godly sorrow.* I had thought that all pollution of the soule of man had been by sinne onely, Mar. 7. 23.

You are much mistaken, when you say, that they who thinke originall sinne no sinne, may bee advised to true grieve and sorrow for it on their owne principles. If by true grieve you meane a godly sorrow, no man mournes for sinne after a godly manner but he that grieves for it as a sin against God. Sir, in a Practicall Catechisme, you should have laid undeniable grounds of repentance; and therefore either plainly proved, or at least resolutely asserted originall sinne to be a sinne, without any *ifs* or *ands*: For where shall a man begin in his repentance, if he bee not convinced that originall sinne is a sinne? should hee not lay the axe to the root of corruption, and bewaile the fountaine of pollution? will not hee be apt to doubt whether actuall sinnes be sinnes, who doubts whether an inclination to all sinne be a sinne? surely such an acute wretch will say, My inclination to such and such an act is naturall, and not evill: *Ergo* this and the like acts, to which I am naturally inclined, are not evill. You know that I could adde; let mee beseech you to consider what hath been said, and I will passe on to your fourth report.

Your fourth Report concernes Justification. Sir, I did not desire you to give an account of your faith, but I should have been glad that you would have vouchsafed an answer to my *queries*. I thanke you for your second acknowledgement that you were misinformed; and I thanke you for your endeavour to prevent mistakes. Truly Sir, I doe not wilfully mistake your sense, nor doe I desire to take any advantage of an hasty expression.

Your first Proposition is, that *justification is divine acceptation and pardon of sinne*. I will not stand to aske you why you put acceptation before pardon; it is likely that was not done

de industria; but I would know why you speake of remission and acceptation, and leave out imputation? I observe, that in your second proposition you doe affirme that [*The mercy of God, through the satisfaction and merits of Christ, is the sole cause of this justification.*] Doe not thinke mee too curious, since you desire mee to give my opinion of these propositions; you know, there are some that distinguish between a first and second justification; and they doe expresse themselves warily, and they will grant what you say, so you will give them leave to chuse which they meane, this, or that justification. But I will judge charitably of you, hoping that by this justification you intend not to imply that there is another justification; and so, as they say, a first and second justification. Give me leave to aske you a question or two about the second proposition, compared with the fourth, and with some passages in your *Practicall Catechisme*, that by a cleare answer to a few *quæres*, many mistakes may be prevented.

In your second proposition you say, *The mercy of God, through the satisfaction and merits of Christ, is the sole cause of justification.*
Pract. Cat. p. 5. In your Catechisme you say, *That Christ did sacrifice himselfe for all the sin of all mankind*; and yet in your fourth proposition in this last return you say [*That this worke of grace in God through Christ, is not every mans portion.*] Sir, if Christs satisfaction bee the sole cause, and hee hath made satisfaction for every man, the grace of God (which extends as farre as Christs satisfaction) must be the portion of every man for his justification by the obedience of Christ alone. My first *quære* then is, 1 Why the grace of God in justifying those for whom Christ hath satisfied, doth not extend to every man for whom he hath satisfied? 2 Whether the qualification and condition, which you require in the subject bee bestowed upon the elect absolutely or conditionally? Regeneration you say is a condition which doth dispose the subject for justification, that is, for acceptance and pardon, as I conceive, and you expresse. Pray Sir, shew mee what condition God requires unregenerate persons to perform, that they may attaine unto regeneration, which you take to be the condition of justification. I acknowledge, that God doth never justify an impenitent infidell in *sensu composito*, that is, the infidell doth not remaine an impenitent infidell; but then you must grant on the other side, that God doth justify the ungodly. 3 Whether there be any

condition which doth so qualifie the subject, as that you can say, by these habits, acts, vowes, and these onely I am justified? *Pract. Catech. page 28.* Sir, Learned men say that there is no condition required to dispose the subject for justification; but there is a condition, namely Faith, bestowed upon none but the elect, to receive the object of justification, Christ, and his compleate obedience, perfect righteousness; and hence (as I conceive) some men (that meant well) say, there is a condition required, that is, to receive the object: and others say, there is no condition required, that is, to dispose or qualifie the subject, so as that the subject shall bee constituted righteous by that disposition or qualification. I speake as plainly as I can devise, that there may bee no mistake. God doth by his free and effectuall grace worke the hearts of his elect to receive Christ, that they may bee justified; not by their own obedience, or vow of obedience, but by the obedience of Christ alone, freely imputed by God, and rested on by faith onely.

Moreover, Learned men doe distinguish betweene disposing of the subject to salvation (which is the last part of the execution of Gods decree of election) and disposing the subject unto justification: though they grant that there is a condition to enable the subject to receive the object Jesus Christ, who is *Propitius* our righteousness. And therefore Protestants do maintaine, that all the habits and acts of grace which are in the best of men concurring together, are not sufficient to justifie a man before God, and therefore faith concurring with a vow of obedience, or any faithfull actions, cannot justifie us: Though faith alone bee said to justifie us Relatively, that is, in regard of the object received by faith. I acknowledge with you, that justification is Gods act, wee cannot pardon our selves, and God sitting as a fatherly Judge upon a throne of grace, doth justifie us *as 4. 100.* as *Chrysostome* upon the 8. of *Rom. 33. vers.* Sir, let me intreat you not to wonder, that I find fault with some passages in your Book, which you say are in effect places of Scripture. Sir, to abuse the Scripture for the maintenance of any error, is to my apprehension a great deale worse then to deliver any erroneous conceits in our own language. The Papists say as you doe, that they say no more then St. *James* himselfe. I did not dream, that you thought *Abraham* was justified by the actual sacrifice of his sonne: *Doc. mo. faith. A. Abraham*

A Copy of some Papers

Abraham was justified by offering up of *Isaac*. I doe not think he means it in any other sense then that which you repeat; namely, that *Abraham* was justified by a resolution to obey God in the sacrificing of his Sonne, not by the actuall sacrificing of him.

Sir, I am heartily glad to heare you acknowledg that you agree with mee in the conclusion: bee pleased to retract all that is contrary to that conclusion in your *Pract. Catechisme*, and then I am sure you must retract what I complained of. Pray Sir, doe you not thinke that we are justified by a sincere vow of obedience, as truly as wee are by faith? that is, that our vow of obedience is a condition of Justification; I doe not say an instrument, for you deny faith to bee an instrument of justification. And therefore if a sincere vow of obedience be the condition of justification, wee are justified as truly by that, as by faith. 2 Consider that you say in this last returne, p. 20.

[*The condition must bee undertaken before the Covenant belongs to me.*] This vow or resolution of obedience is, as I conceive, that which you call the undertaking of the condition; why then surely obedience is the condition of the Covenant of justification, for obedience is that which is undertaken in a vow of obedience. 3 If by Covenant you meane the whole Covenant of grace, you must make some condition goe before our regeneration also. 4 You know the Papists speake as fully as you doe any where for the meritorious satisfaction of Christ: but you know what they say of the *previous dispositions*, to dispose and qualifie the subject for justification; and you know what others say of the vow of obedience. 5 Though to give a pardon bee Gods act, yet to receive forgiveness is an act of faith. *Acts*. 26. 18. Wee doe not receive a pardon by an act of charity, or by a vow of obedience, or receiving of Christ as King, and giving up the obedience of the heart to him; I beleeve you have not forgotten these expressions which are scattered up and downe in your *Catechisme* and *Papers*. If faithfull actions bee the onely thing whereby a man is justified, as you affirme page 28. then are wee not justified onely by a vow of obedience. If faith bee insufficient to our justification, unlesse it bee consummate by love, that is, by acts of Christian charity, or keeping the Commandements of God, as you expound that

phrase, page 35. then sure you cannot say you plead onely for justification by a vow of obedience. Unlesse you will make a first and second justification, I doe not see how you can come off. On the other side, if wee are justified by a vow of personall obedience, then wee are not justified by the obedience of Christ alone, or by faith onely; I meane, by the obedience of Christ, as that obedience whereby wee are constituted righteous; nor by faith onely, as that whereby wee receive a pardon; receive Christ as *Iehovah our righteousness*: and therefore truly Sir, I doe not yet see how you can agree with mee in my conclusion; namely, that we are justified by the obedience of Christ alone, freely imputed by God, applyed and rested on by faith onely, unlesse you will retract those passages in your Booke, which were justly complained of, for the good of you, and this whole University. I speake plainly and freely, as it becometh

Octob. 30. 1646.

Your Friend to serve you

Fr. Cheynell.

SIR,

ON Saturday, October 31. I received your Papers (dated the day before) by way of return to mine of October 20. That night I got a liberty from other avocations to read them over, and am now on Monday at the beginning of the weeke following on preparation to give you some account of them. Your letter which conducted them was but briefe, yet was willing to take notice of one particular, that of your having written *morpha* with *s*, which though it bee onely a grammaticall *opake*, and very extrinsecal to the matter in hand, yet seeing you are pleased to make it the onely subject of those few lines, I must in civility tell you somewhat of your manner of excusing it. That literall mistake you know you were guilty of, and I onely told

you that you were so, and added not one word more. Instead of excusing or confessing in, you now desire more onely to pardon the mistakes of an ill *Amanuensis*, and adde your reasons that forced you to make use of him. Sir, I will doe more then you desire. First, I will pardon that former mistake in yourselfe also; and tell you, that in one that undertakes to bee a Scholar, (and to be very severe to those writings of other men, which many pious persons have beene willing to receive with some kindnesse, and now professe to see no kinde of ground for your quarrells in them,) the not spelling so plaine a word of Greeke, would by very many men bee hardly excused; I meane, it would take off from their opinion of your learning, as much as if you had written *impine* with a [y], that is, more then many faults of a higher nature could bee to doe. Secondly, I will believe (or excuse) your saying, that your haste forced you to dictate to an ill *Amanuensis*, when I have some reasons to thinke it did not. 1 Because you had had my last Returne in your hands ten dayes, and I suppose the occasion that caused your haste, was not knowne to you all that time, or more dayes then one or two of them: for I professe to think your avocation so very urgent, and should bee sorry to heare that it was the occasion of detaining you one minute; but then before you knew of it, I suppose that did not force you to choose this shorter way. This was my first reason. 2 Because the *Amanuensis* was so farre from being an ill one, that in the whole paper I know but of one failing in the kinde forementioned; and that is in the word Sacrifice, where in stead of the letter c. there is s, which is in effect to write *facio* with s. But then upon the first sight this plainly appears to be your owne hand, interposing this word in stead of another blotted out, as you know I can discerne both by your former Letters, and by the like alterations in other places of these Papers. This againe inclines mee to believe, that the dictating you mention, might bee designed a little to conceale such slips which might possibly fall from you, and that it was not forced by your haste onely. My third Reason is; because I conceive it farre more speedy way to write from my own phantasie or understanding (which may be done without any stay but that of inventing and writing,) then to dictate to another, wherein much longer time is required for mee

to dictate articulately, and for him after that to write, then to
 gaine to recite to mee what he hath written, before I can pro-
 ceed to dictate. In this I can speake but mine owne, and some
 others sense, and the common notion that I have of it; but
 considering how farre my notions are wont to bee from pleasing
 you, and that 'tis possible you might mean dictating out of your
 Note-booke, where you may have throwne together all your
 exceptions against that Author (for that your *Amicus* tran-
 scribed what you had formerly writ, I suppose you doe not
 meane that by dictating,) on these grounds, I say, it is possi-
 ble here may bee some difference in judgement between us also.
 And therefore if againe you tell mee, that you have spoken your
 full sense in this particular, I shall make all haste to beleeeve you,
 and aske you pardon for this importunity: Yet in the meane
 time I will tell you my reasons also for my being so free with
 you in *materia non gravi*. 1 Because I discerned so little in your
 future discourse which would bee more pertinent to the matter
 of my last retort; having found, that after my having answer-
 ed or laid grounds of answering neare twenty questions in your
 last Paper, more then the matter in hand, or my leisure enga-
 ged mee to, you have thought fit to spring new matters of con-
 troversie, and to that purpose (that you may never faile of the
 like matter) to catechise mee in a strange number of questions
 more; when the whole intention of my Paper was, that it might
 bee considered, whether you had not wronged that Author in
 your first quarrells at that Booke; and not to engage my selfe
 in discourse for ever with him that had so little pleasure in any
 thing of mine. 2 Because by some such infirmities as these be-
 ing represented to you, you might thinke it possible for you to
 mistake in greater matters. For truly, I thinke it farre more
 possible for a Scholar (that reads hastily, and is intent to note
 and number faults) to impose causelessly upon his Author, then
 to commit such slips, (and not mend them at the review) when
 hee writes as hastily. And truly if I did not beleeeve that this
 which I have written were fit to perswade you that this were
 possible; and did I not hope, that being calmly mentioned to
 you, it would perswade you, I would not venture it to your
 eyes; and if I am mistaken in my beleefe or hope, doe but tell
 mee so, and I promise you to retract my errors, to aske you

A Copy of some Papers

pardon in my next, and (to reparaire all the injury that can bee possibly consequent to the error) to throw thus much of the Paper into the fire, and not to permit it to the eyes of any other judge or witness, when you have thus signified your pleasure to mee.

I shall now proceed to your enclosed; and for your first period, [where you repeate onely, and say you have done;] I answer, that I have done also.

In the repetition of the discourse of *exact account*, &c. there is a great mistake, viz. That, *because when I was at highest I would have shewed as much civility towards any Minister of Christ, as I did toward you, therefore my present desiring an exact account of your speeches concerning the Author of the Catechisme was the exercising jurisdiction over you.* I must needs tell you that in my opinion height and dignity in the Church, is not a proper ground of lessening civility, but an obligation to encrease it to all Ministers of Christ, from that example of our Saviour, who when he acknowledges the title of Lord from the Disciples to bee well bestowed on him, *Joh. 13. 13.* doth yet wash their feet, and give them an example of doing the like, (*v. 14.*) when they are at the highest also, and so *Matth. 20. 27.* and in the parallel places, hee requires them to expresse their greatnesse in the *ἑσὼ δόξαν*, and sets them his owne copie of the *ἐκ ἑαυτοῦ διακονήσας, ἀλλὰ διακονήσας*, and you shall have my opinion (and I should bee glad to be told of it, if my practise hath not been agreeable to it) that (as he that is not the more liberall and extensively charitable for having received the benefit of Ecclesiasticall preferments, so) hee that is not the more civill and truly humble for having received any dignity in the Church, hath somewhat of the *Gentiles ὑπερηφανεύων & ὑπερηφανίζων* in him, and hath no countenance from Christ, or Apostolicall institution or practise, for that misbehaviour in his dignity. From hence Sir, I will leave (and not helpe) you to conclude, that how civill soever I would have beene to any Minister in any degree of greatnesse, or how civill soever any Generall may bee, if hee please, to his souldiers, my being thus civill now, (and no more) is not exercising jurisdiction over you, *ἐμπόδισις διατάξας*, the onely thing which I had then to demonstrate; and so I have said enough (and shall consent to the truth of your [*too much*]) of that also.

Next

Next for your grave smile, I shall not question it, or deny you those delights, so the *ridendum dicere verum* may go along with it, but sure the graver the smile was, the more it became you not to impose on mee the exercising jurisdiction over you then, or challenging you now, while I onely desired and begged, requested and re-inforced my request, (that you would give mee an exact account of what you had publicquely said of that Author) on purpose that I might think no ill of you causelessly; Certainly Sir, such a carriage as this, thus grounded and designed, will neither provoke a grave smile, nor passe either for act of jurisdiction or for challenge; or if it must, no man shall ever bee admonished for having trespassed against a brother, and so be brought to repentance for it, *Matth. 18. 15.* nor shall he that heares (or hath matter of suspition) that any injury hath beene done him by another, have meanes of knowing, surely whether hee heares or suspects with cause, or no. Asfor your affirmation, That sure I am too angry when I say you have reproached and slandered mee, from whence you conceive, I endeavour to make you happy. Sir, it is a heap of mistakes. For, 1 by the grace which I meekly acknowledge to have received from God, I have beene enabled (and I conceive, in some measure made use of the ability, by the helpe of the same grace) to heare that I have beene reproacht by you, and to tell you so, without being too angry, and therefore you are not sure. 2 I did not say you had reproacht and slandered mee (your additions are alwaies to some advantage of your owne;) I onely said [*to this reproach of yours*] which I conceive was not said without cause; For [to say, that my desiring an exact account of you, and not of others, (when I knew not of any other) was to fall foule on you,] cannot be lesse then a reproach; nay, your addition was true, (though then I did not say it, and now I transcribe it from your Paper, without any passion,) it was a slander also. 3 Hee that is too angry, doth not at all (by that act) endeavour to make him happy with whom hee is too angry; at least, not by the importance of that Text, *Matth. 5. 11.* unlesse the *συζητῆς* or *ὀυδισιμῶ* be added to it; and that you doe not in this pretend I was guilty of; of which yet I confesse to have been as guilty in those words, as of the too much anger. 4 It ought to bee proved, that my calling your words a reproach was without a cause also

(which you doe not attempt to doe,) or else from thence your conclusion had no right to be induced.

In the next businesse, concerning my returne to the passage read out of the Catechisme in your *Carfax-Sermon*, you are in great haste, passing through all the many pages which I had sent you to satisfie you about that matter, till you meet with a citation of the *View of the Directory*: and then you thinke you have an occasion to leape into a new field, and presently tell mee of my *fatherly smile* upon that *pretty babe*; (I beseech you, bee more solemne, and impose not on mee either smiles or fondnesse to any creature of mine; or however, doe not first faine smiles, and then build conclusions upon them) and without more adoe you spend foure *Sections* in asking mee questions, and setting mee tasks about that *View of the Directory*, and severall passages in that Author. I cannot thinke this is the way of replying; it is certainly at the best, diverting to another matter.

But Sir, in your speedy passage to this other field you scattered something which I shall not despise so farre as not to take up after you; and tell you, 1 That (whatever you did) you ought to have beleaved, from the very nature and importance of the word *magis dicit*, that the advantage which I made of it was very proper to bee made: and why you tell mee you never thought it, and neither answer my reason, nor give mee any to the contrary, I cannot imagine; in your haste, that unimportant speech of yours might have beene omitted as well as any other. 2 For those speeches of mine (whereon you judge my uncharitableness, and are pleased to expresse your sorrow for it,) I must professe you have wholly mistaken them; and I think that is done by you very unreasonably, at the very minute when you had said you desire not to mistake my meaning, and are so kinde as to bee sorry for mee. For let mee tell you, that such mistakings are least incident to them that are such lovers of truth, and so sorry to see others uncharitable. Now for your mistakes, I conceive they will be cleare to any man that reads the words; I am sure they are to mee, that know my sense: I said, That if I thought you sought for any thing but exceptions, I would adde as to a Scholar and a friend, &c. This no way intimates my looking on you as no Scholar, or no Friend to mee, much lesse as on my *unlearned enemy*. (which againe you adde *supra computum*.) I beseech

seeke you, doe so no more, for there is difference betwixt no friend and an enemy, as betwixt positive hating and negative not-loving) but rather that I did looke on you (and meant to deale with you) as both a Scholar and a Friend; if that onely third thing, *my thought that you did not seeke for any thing but exceptions*] did not interpose and hinder mee. From this 'tis cleare, that the utmost that could bee charged upon that speech, was my *thought that you sought not for any thing but exceptions*; which if I had been guilty of, I doe not yet discern it had beene uncharitable, because in all the passages betweene you and mee at this time, exceptions at that Author, and at my words, have been the whole affaire discernible by mee, and so there was no ground to oblige my charity to thinke (whatsoever possibility might bee, on which to hope) any other of you. But I shall not need grant you that my former speech intimated this neither; for my words, taken and joynd with what follows, doe not so much as intimate that I did positively thinke, &c. (for beside that *suppositio non ponit*, and [if] is but a marke of a supposition) my doing the contrary to that which would have regularly beene superstructed on that *thought*, (as it is apparent I doe, by my freely adding my whole sense in the words immediately following) makes that [if] to bee farre from an intimation by which you might conclude that I did thinke what is there mentioned. Hee that proposes hypothetically [if a man were any better then a stone, then hee would learne something] and then assume not that hee learns nothing, but contrariwise within few lines affirms that hee doth learne very aptly, doth certainly not so much as intimate by that [if] that hee is no better then a stone, but rather clearely affirms the contrary. Bee pleased to apply it to the case in hand, and you will finde you were too hasty to conclude me uncharitable, as before you were too willing to conclude mee angry.

In the next place; whereas you adde, *That I professe, not to cast up a Ball of new contention, but onely am pleased to referre you to another Booke, the view of the Direct.* This, I suppose, was a product of your haste also, for the former part of that speech was by mee delivered of one thing, *viz.* of that account given you *ex abundanti* of my sense of that whole matter about Liturgy; among the Apostles, which therefore was not in any sense to be-

become matter of new contention, for then there would bee no end. But the second thing (my reference to the *View of the Direct.*) came in afterwards, in my answer to your first question, and that too with a [*besides*] a note of an *ex abundanti* also, when I had before sufficiently answered your question, at least so answered as that you reply not to it. What you meant by making this change, and mixing of things so distant, you will (I hope) upon examination of your selfe remember. And I beseech you, for my sake to doe it, that there may hereafter bee some few lesse materiall passages in your discourse, which may bee pas't over by mee without occasion of confuting: For as yet you see there hath been nothing of any deep consideration, and yet nothing that deserved not some animadversion.

Sir, I come now to the new field you desire to lead mee to, the severall passages which you now newly mention in the *View of the Directory*, and the taskes and questions that you offer mee on that new occasion, without any the least temptation offered by mee to bring you to it (for they are not those places which I had referr'd you to, to which you make these exceptions,) and which is most unreasonable, before you had either said one word in answer to what I had now produced on that matter, or confesse your selfe satisfied with it: I must leave you againe to passe sentence on your selfe for this behaviour; and to consider, that you have no way encouraged mee to undertake all your commands, or defend at this time every part of every Booke which you shall have leisure to except against. Yet Sir, I am resolved to faile you in nothing that you can vouchsafe to thinke reasonable for you to expect, on condition that for the future you will weigh your scruples better before you throw them into your Papers.

First you say, the Author of that *View* layes downe this rule, pag. 2. *Nothing is necessary in the worship of God, but what God hath prescribed.*] and from thence demand how many severalls of the *Common-Prayer-Booke*, that are purposely left out in the *Directory*, are prescribed by God?

This will be very admirable to him that lookes on that 2 page of that *View*. For first, that which you say, that layes downe for a rule, is there produced onely as a ground of the adversary with whom the Author of the *View*, there disputes, in these plaine words

words [*I shall suppose it granted by them with whom I now dispute, that nothing is necessary, &c.*] If I shall labour at any time to confute or answer you by an argument or answer *ad hominem*, by urging somewhat against you, that you take for a principle, and mention it as a thing which I suppose granted by you, would you ever thinke fit to impose this principle of yours as a rule laid downe by mee ? If you will offer to doe this, or now concale that you doe it, and make advantage of it, there is no disputing with you. But then secondly, you must take notice what 'twas that the Author of the *View* was there a proving, not any necessitie of retaining all or any of the severalls of our *Liturgie*, but that there was no *necessity of abolishing the Booke, &c.* That was the easie taske hee had to prove against them that affirmed to thinke it necessary to abolish it : and you must not set that inanimate booke new tasks (as you doe mee;) or if you doe, you must not thus expect to be obeyed. Now I have gone thus farre ; I do remember to have heard that you objected some such thing to the Author of that *View* (under the title of *the same person who was the Author of the Catechisme*) in your *Carfax-Sermon*, and challenged him to prove that our *Liturgie* was necessary. If the having said it there, and having conceal'd it when you were pleased to give mee an account of that Sermon, caused or occasioned your inserting it in this place, then though it bee now a kinde of restitution to give it mee here, which then you were willing to keepe from mee, (of which nature I have heard of more, which I shall anon mention to you,) yet shall I not thanke you for it, because you doe it under another *species* ; but shall onely complaine, that both there and here you were either very unkind in not observing the maine argument of that whole first part of that Booke, or else very unjust, if you did discern it, and were willing to impose so distant a theme upon that Author.

To your second accusation, I must as briefly say, that that Author abuses neither *Presbyterian* nor *Independent* ; onely mentions the severall influences which hee professes himselfe forced to beleve that they had, the one sort into the premisses, the other into the conclusion ; and renders his reasons for it, because the conclusion is very distant from what the premisses would necessarily inferre (*viz.* a necessity of abolishing our Book, when

A Copy of some Papers

none of the three premises ascended neare so high) and that which the *Presbyterians*, as hee conceives, would not affirm, (for sure all of that perswasion doe not, or have not alwayes thought it necessary to abolish set Formes :) and I now demand of you, whether in this thought hee did abuse them ; or if not, what else hee did say of them that can deserve that phrase from you. For the arguments proposed by either] as farre as the Booke with which hee undertooke to deale did propose or intimate them, you know hee hath answered them ; and till those answers are disproved, they may passe for good ones. For your challenge in the name of your *Reverend Brethren of Scotland*, I know not what occasioned it, unlesse some citations out of Mr. *Knox's Liturgie* : and if those were not rightly cited, the pages are noted in the margent, and will presently enable you to disprove them.

To your third of Mr. *Cottons* arguments against set Formes, the businesse of that *View* tempted not that Author, nor doth our present matter of debate incline mee to thinke them necessary to bee taken in. It is not every mans worke to doe every thing at every time : yet perhaps it might bee answer sufficient to you, to tell you that it appears not to mee by any thing that here you say, that you beleieve set Formes unlawfull ; and till you professe you doe, you are perhaps as much obliged to answer Mr. *Cottons* arguments, as that Author ; I am sure, as much as hee is obliged to shew how many things are prescribed by God, and rejected by you in the Directory, when hee looks not on the Liturgie which hee defends, as any of Gods prescribing, but onely presses the no-necessity (from thence or from other grounds) of abolishing it, and after proceeds to some other particulars about it ; but no where to the divine prescription of it. If by the answering your *Brethren of Scotland*, you meane any arguments of theirs against set Formes (as you seem to doe by joyning them with Mr. *Cotton*) I am perswaded by some part of that *View* (*viz.* by the Authors producing the practise of the *Scots* for set Formes) that hee never dreamt they had appeared against them, at least so far as to thinke abolishing necessary (which was his only point in hand,) and then you must excuse him that he did not know first, and then not answer them. Yet after all this, what occasion you had to accuse him of triumphing, or of doing it before victory, (when you

you bring no objection against that victory, but onely his not-answering Mr. Cotton, &c. (which were things to which his present task obliged him not, nor so much as intimated that it did ;) and when you object not one word against his answers to that which hee did undertake) I can no more guesse, then at the reason why that Author might not (for some things which hee had so particularly defended, and was never confuted by any) refer you to Mr. Hooker, or why the state of the question is so varied, as you say it is.

For the fourth charge and question [*How it will be proved necessary, that any whole set Forme of Liturgie should bee rigorously imposed, &c.*] all that I shall need to say in vindication of that Author is, that hee is never forced by the taske before him to prove any such thing ; if it bee not necessary to bee abolished ; it is enough for his turne against his adversary. And then for your opinion of the matter or object of my passionate longing, or earnest contention (who, I thanke God, am at this time neither passionate, nor longing, nor earnest, nor contentious for any thing but that you would permit mee to to bee quiet) I shall not need bee much concern'd, because all that you bring to prove all this against mee, is, that if it bee not true, you are much mistaken : in which you cannot blame mee, if I grant the conclusion, because 'tis easier farre then the other member, which you have left mee, [*viz. to prove clearely and undeniably,*] which sure is not every mans taske, especially when you are the person I must approve these proofes to. Onely I must desire you to remember, that to make it unlawfull to use this set Forme, is much more then to relaxate or forbid a rigorous imposing ; and the former of these had been possible to have been done, without the latter.

5. For my not owning a necessity, that the Liturgy formed in the Apostles times should be continued in the Church, i. e. (as I there expresse) *that that very Liturgy should bee continued without any alteration or additions*, I am content to joyne with you ; but with you had not mangled my words ; 1. by putting in *alienation and exchange* (which is there applyed to lands, not to Liturgy ; and onely used as a resemblance to shew that he that saith, [*The holy Ghost enabled a Ministry to forme a Liturgy to continue*] doth not assume that it was necessary to continue, any more then hee that

leaves land to continue to his heires, obliges them from ever alienating, &c. which similitude will enforce a *major*, what I conclude from it, the no-necessity of not adding or altering that Liturgie; but (whatsoever it might doe) is not there brought home to that of alienating, &c. because it is not by him that brought it, applyed so farre, (as you will see in the place.) 2 By saying, *That I give the present Church leave to judge of the Liturgy composed in the time of the Apostles, and to make* (as what alterations and additions, which onely I did say, so) *what alienation or exchange shall seeme fit to the present Church.* Wherein you have inserted and imposed on me almost every word recited particularly [*the present Church, &c.*] in stead of [*the Church*] (which signified quite another matter, *viz.* the Church either of those Apostolicall men, or those next following them,) and the Church againe not onely in order to adding or altering as they should thinke fit, but (which differs much from it) of abolishing, as the affaire now stands; or, as you there say, *alienating and exchanging*: (not to mention, that I no where have yet given that Church leave indefinitely to judge of the Liturgie, much lesse the present Church to judge so farre as to alienate.) Certainly a man may affirme, that the Church next after the Apostles times may have leave to alter somewhat, (as occasions might alter,) and to adde somewhat (as they thought fit) to the constant Formes used by the Apostles, and so to settle somewhat in the Church (by that adding) which might supply the place of the *χαρισμα ἱερῆς* which the Apostles had above the succeeding Church, and yet not give the present Church of England, or any persons in it, which are not the present Church in any notion of it, leave to cast out all set Forms, particularly those which without any alteration, those first ages of the Church had delivered downe to us from the Apostles. So againe afterwards, you much vary the state, when you talke of men of ordinary gifts taking upon them to passe a peremptory sentence for alienation or exchange. Who would thinke that [*the Primitive Churches thinking fit to adde or alter,*] should be so improved under your hands? (I beseech you once more never to alter one word in the period with which you are displeased; for other men that are in any degree credulous, or not very wary, may bee deceived by your doing so; though you see I am not
alto-

altogether so ignorant of my owne sense, or of your wont, as to depend on you without examining.) You see now how little right your conclusion of that fifth *Set.* had to bee induced upon any words of mine: and yet let mee tell you, that if it were granted you possible, That a *Minister may pray as in a Congregation without the use of the Liturgie formed in the Apostles times, &c.* nay, without the helpe of the late *Common-prayer-booke*, yet will it not follow from thence, that it is well done to abolish (with this Liturgie) all set Forms, much lesse that it was necessary to abolish this.

To your sixth you already discern my answer, that neither I nor the Author of the *View* are obliged to shew you any Liturgie, and avouch that it is (I suppose you meane) that formed in the Apostles times without any interpolation, &c.

In your seventh you will not spend time about the *miraculous gift of prayer*, (which if you had done, and observed the use that I there made of that doctrine to the present purpose, it would have stood you in some stead, at least kept you from being ignorant of my sense, and (the consequent of it) your asking of more questions,) and I will not spend any more time about your severall questions then to tell you, that all that I now, or the Author of the *View* contend for, doth not prove us concern'd in those new *quæres*: for were it granted, that there were an *ordinary gift of prayer*, and that to be stirred up and exercised, that *Ministers should study to pray seasonably*, (which I suppose is not to pray *ex tempore* because you say *study*) that he that hath not ordinary wisdom to pray as hee ought, is not called by Christ to bee a Minister of the Gospel, (and yet sure hee that hath that ordinary wisdom to pray as hee ought upon premeditation, may pray as hee ought not, upon sudden effusion; and the Liturgie would a litle prevent that, and perhaps enable him to pray more to the edification of the people, then hee is able to doe, who yet is able in some degree to pray as hee ought) and that it doth not follow that the *Liturgies under the name of St. James and St. Marke should be rigorously imposed*, nay, that it were true that there are some *endowed with the spirit of prayer*, (as that is by you set, for somewhat more then the ordinary gift, and which it will bee heard for any man to demonstrate to others that hee is truly possesse of) were, I say, all this granted to you, yet sure from all this heape of *data* (if,

they were *concess'd* too) it would not follow that it was necessary, or so much as tolerably well done, to abolish all set Formes in the publique service of God, which was the prime thing by that *View* insisted on.

To your eight [*about Psalmes and use of the Lords prayer,*] I was not to be accused for too *slight a view of the Direct.* but you for not observing to what purpose I now mentioned these. It was to shew the use of set Formes in the Apostles times, and then 1 You must marke, that the using of some set *Psalmes* by all the people as a part of prayer or thanksgiving, differs somewhat from reading them as any other piece of Scripture; and let me tell you by the way, that either the singing of them, or the manner of reading them *alternatim*, is a mark (though not inseparable) of that difference. 2 That the recommending the Lords Prayer is not so much as the Apostles constant using it in their service, (especially of the Eucharist) nor proportionable to our Saviours [*When you pray, say, Our Father,*] and yet I suppose you will not doubt to observe with me, that there are many that acknowledge it recommended in the Directory, that constantly abstaine from using it in their Pulpits. 3 That I conceive my selfe to have demonstrated more then the use of *Psalmes* and the *Lords Prayer* (if by demonstrating you meane proving by the authority of Witnesses *sic de dignis*, (which is the highest way of demonstration, that matters of fact are capable of.) 4 That [*for your rule of holding forth such things as are of divine institution in every ordinance, and setting forth other things according to the rules of Christian Prudence agreeable to the generall rules of the Word of God;* this is not the first time you have been told, that it is an excellent rule, and that it is farre from concluding any necessity of abolishing all set Formes; or even all or any part of our present Liturgy. As for the cause I have of complaining of discord and confusion in your publique Worship, I am not engaged by any thing I have said to give you any answer, having not ventured on such a degree of boldnesse, to speake so grossely either against the generall use of the Directory, or against any of your particular exercises of your gifts. Lastly, I acknowledge I did tell you, that wee may pray as wee ought without the very Liturgie formed in the Apostles times, and so nothing hinders but that I may goe on also to the next particular; which you will give mee leave to have called the *third* *part*

of my task, because it was then the *longest*, not because it had any thing else beside the length, and other things of that nature, (supposing still that you meane not any solid exception, or any strength of argument to be repell'd) which might make it either taske, or sad to mee. In that I shall not finde any fault that the businesse of the Trinity is at length dismiss't, but suppose that you have received satisfaction in that point. Onely it had not been any great matter if you had vouchsafed to tell mee you were so satisfied. But I must not expect those acts of grace from you. I shall therefore follow as you lead mee. And 1 Sir, concerning the *sad story*, (as you please to call it) I am much tempted to wonder (but that I have for sometime a little resolved to give over that innocent quality, and learne with *Numicius* that *prope rem unam, Nil admirari*) that it should produce but one thing in you, and that should be gladnesse. For though the gladnesse, as you have fastned it, I shall not thinke a fault in you, but bee also glad with you, that *I have disabused one offender*, (whose sinne no man but you, and his owne soule was guilty of;) yet that it should not be matter of some sorrow or regret to you, to have been the occasion of that offence in him, (which is certainly to scandalize your weake brother and leave it still possible for many other, through that scandall to stumble and fall in like manner;) this must bee matter of wonder and admiration to mee, but withall of advertisement what I am to expect from you by way of return to any act of Christian admonition, and for that you shall give me leave to be heartily sorry, though you will not.

For you command, [*That I should venture your arguments to any Reader, &c.*] I professe my self ready to obey you: and therefore shall now take boldnesse to tell you, that I doe expect from you, according to the purport of this speech of yours, that you will give your consent that this whole matter be referred to others judgement; and to that end, that all that hath thus past between us be straight-way Printed; and I will then desire no further satisfaction for the injury which I conceive my selfe to have received from you. As for the witnesse you desire the matter shall depend on, *viz. that Book as it was printed at Oxford*, I shall be as ready as you to stand to it, and by that to have it tryed, whether the Author of that *Catechisme* in that first edition gave any Christian man any degree of liberty (more then you your self confesse is his due) of swearing.

swearing. This way of tryall I shall never refuse, but proresse to you (what before I told you) that the advertising you of the addition in the last edition was perfectly *ex abundanti*, and that the Author was justified sufficiently from the main part of that charge (*viz. giving youth liberty to swear*) without it. And therefore by the way let mee tell you, that when that Author had in the simplicity of his heart put in those words of the *primary intention* to prevent all mistake in the most ignorant, (not questioning but that all ordinarily learned or intelligent would understand without it,) for you to fasten peculiarly upon that one supernumerary answer of mine, and to make such shewes of triumph, and impute clancular dealing to that Author, and a great deale more, (on so no manner of grounds or probabilities, when all is laid together) is that, which you ought to lay to your heart, though you will not the sad Story. What you adde againe to the same purpose, after so full an answer, is like all the rest; and as I must not thinke that strange neither, so I despaire that my repeating my former answers will provoke or invite any better dealing from you.

In your next Section beginning with, [*Sir, your first answer, &c.*] you have, I conceive, one new mistake. For by your [*mark that*] twice repeated, I suppose you would have it marked that that *Car.* affirms no more to be forbidden by the third Commandement, then the *non-performance of promissory oaths*. If you meane thus, you are much mistaken. All that is toward that sense is onely this, that the second part of the words cited by Christ, [*Thou shalt pay unto the Lord thy vowes,*] explains the meaning of the third Commandement to be against perjury or non-performance of promissory oaths. Do you now please to marke, [*against perjury*] not denying but that the falseness of assertory oaths, which is also perjury, is there meant by the words of the third Commandement; but giving the non-performance of promissory oaths, a speciall right to the negative part of that Commandement, as it is there lookt on by Christ. And I beseech you consider, & passe your conjecture, what did, or could move that Author to adde that distinct mention of promissory oaths in that place, but those words which there Christ recites, [*Thou shalt pay, &c.*] and do you tell me, if they doe not peculiarly (nay, onely belong to promissory, (for sure assertory oaths are not capable of being thus paid) and if the Author thus

strictly

strictly desired to follow Christs method, ought this to bee imputed to him? Certainly not, when hee never made question but that assertory oaths were meant also by the third Commandement, and distinctly affirmed that perjury (which sure contains that) was there forbidden. The considering of this might rather have suggested to you this truth, that that Author was carefull to make it his first taske, or part of his method, to weigh the literall importance of each part of the Text, and gaine as much from each part, against the sinne, as hee was sure it would necessarily import, and then to build upon it, what by reduction, (i. e. by any thing but the primary literall importance) what by Christs superadditions, i. e. by the words induced with a [*But I say unto you*] whether they note new precepts, or onely new light) would bee as firmly superstructed. And your want of observing this method, this designe of that Author, is the likeliest thing, that in charity I can pitch on for the occasion of your mistake in any part of this matter; though for your affirming that this Catechism gave any Christian liberty of swearing, I cannot be just if I speake so favourably. To this, which I conceived a new mistake in you, I must adde another old one in that Section, viz. that you will still talk of my severall Editions, (and not mean that last where the additions are set;) when you have been so oft assured of this truth (of which I can produce the confirmation of severall oaths) that I never had the least knowledge of, or gave consent to any other but the first Oxford printing of those few Copies, and those last additions.

For the second thing, which is so cleare to you, 'twill bee acknowledged farre from being so, if I againe tell you that the meaning of those words of the second question, [*Whether the third Commandement is no more, &c.*] is most precisely this, whether the literall importance, (or if you will, the literall meaning) of the third Commandement bee no more, &c. and that will well agree with the first question, what is the meaning of the old Commandement, (viz. as 'tis delivered by Christ in these words *in memoriam*, and the consequents out of other places, *Thou shalt performe, &c.*) that is againe the literall meaning, or the necessary importance of the words produced by Christ, agreeable to which is the answer, that 'tis set to expresse it to be, as literally it sounds, against perjury, &c.

3 'Tis not very reasonable for you to over-rule all others, by saying the question is not, when I have as much reason to know as you, (being so well knowne to him that set the question) and affirm it is, or (because with you *the intention of a phrase* is a hard expression) to conclude from thence, that *it must bee explained by the intention of the Law-giver*, whereas I againe tell you that the literall notation of the phrase is the thing that was meant by it, and not the intention (I meane, the totall full intention) of the Law-giver.

4 For the question of *what is primary and secondary in Gods intention*, [*which you would not have disputed*,] that you ought to have spared also: for againe I say, 'tis about the primary or secondary notation of the phrase. But you by drawing in (before) the intention of the Law-giver, found it an easie change into the intention of God; but neither of those is the thing here spoken of.

5 I conceive, Christs rendring the third Commandement by *a metaphor*, is, as I was then confident, (beside others) a sufficient prooffe that that is the primary intention of the phrase: and I have reason to continue in that opinion, because you have not dropped any word of answer to it, in all your tale of rejoinders.

6 For the doubtfull [*perhaps*,] if I had reason to blot it out, you need not challenge me for doing what was rationall: the truth is, I was not confident that every body was perswaded or could bee convinced, that all foolish, wanton using of Gods name (if without any kinde of swearing) was forbidden in that Commandement, which onely speakes of taking, or lifting up Gods name, which with the Hebrewes signifies swearing, and (if wisemen may bee beleaved) nothing else: and therefore I was (according to my judgement) more willing to put in [*perhaps*,] then to venture a quarrell with any body in that matter; but afterwards, conceiving the (*reduction*) would beare it, and willing to be as strict in this matter as I could possibly any way justifie (God knowes, farre from any thought of being accused for giving liberty of swearing) I put in (*idle*) in stead of the word (*perhaps*;) and so you have, you see, the fate of shrinking me. I am not permitted to keepe any thing from you; and yet desire not to burthen you with a secret, or to deliver this my confessi-

on under the restraint of any feale to you.

7 I have given you grounds to discern that 'tis not so sure that foolish and wanton using of Gods name is forbidden by that Commandement (in case that foolish using it bee without oaths) as profane or blasphemous using it; the former of which you were told, I conceived to belong to oaths, and those unlawful oaths, (and when not to such oaths, then to something else which was equivalent to them) as [*to profane*], signifies to use that commonly or unworthily, which is onely to bee used in holy matters, and such are oaths resolved to bee; and therefore called *sacramenta*; and the using them in common talke, or to any but that sacred use, is to profane them; and so you see, that was a causelesse exception also. For though some foolish and wanton using of Gods name may be profaning it, i. e. profaning Gods name, or using it lesse solemnly, yet is it not the profaning of a *sacramentum* or oath, which sure is greater then the former.

8 Your conclusion, *truly*, is not true; all that can bee justly concluded of mee from those alterations, is this, that I began to conceive that what I had said against asseratory oaths, might bee made more cleare to all; though 'twere to mee, that knew my owne sense, said clearely enough before; and I ought to be thanked for this care, (especially by you, if to you it was not cleare) and not so oft to bee reproacht for it. And I will once more professe, that to my best remembrance I made no one alteration in that Booke, but onely on designe to explaine, not to alter or retract any thing; or to alter the words that they might more fully speak my sense. I wish there were any thing would content you, but speaking against my conscience; I would not much care then, if you still call'd it *recantation*.

9 You still mistake [*foolish and wanton using of Gods name*] for *swearing*: (and I will bee so charitable to you, as to thinke this is it makes you so hard to bee satisfied in this matter.) But I have oft told you, Gods name may bee used without swearing, and that (not using, but) taking or lifting up his name signifies that. And then why should the [*perhaps*] which is not affix to swearing, but to something else, contribute any thing toward the swearers boldnesse? I beseech you discern what is so manifest and so oft repeated to you. The words there are, *Profane &c.*

is surely there forbidden] and that, I have oft shewed you, contains every unholy, unlawfull oath under it. For your dislike of my instance of *fornication* in the seventh Commandement, there is no remedy ; you will not like any thing that comes from mee ; and yet 'tis sure enough, adultery cannot signifie fornication in the primary sense, or save by reduction ; and besides, if to the particular of fornication you had a propriety of dislike, the other instance of killing would serve the turne, and that you might possibly have either lik'd or confuted also.

Your 10 is but a recitation of what was oft said before, particularly in the first, and second, and ninth, and there you will find it answered.

Your 11 is no faire passage, for though the proving perjury to bee forbidden in the third Commandement, bee the proving a thing that you never denyed, yet the inference of the argument there used being this, that to take Gods name in vaine is no more in the prime sense, or propriety of speech, then to forswear, that you know was the onely thing denyed by you, and therefore the argument in any reason ought to have beene taken notice of.

In the 12 I pray bee not too confident that other men are mistaken ; 'tis in this more possible that you may bee. For when the incredulity of another man is the onely thing that calls for my oath from me in a matter which is not *materia legitima juramenti*, there the Devill having to do in the incredulousnesse, the oath may be said to come from the Devill also.

13 My honour will sufficiently bee provided for in this particular also, after all your scoffes ; for which-soever the super-addition is, of *new precept*, or of *new light*, the super-addition i. e. the thing thus inferred by Christ [*But I say unto you*] or Christs superadding these words, *Swear not at all* (either of which is a frequent ordinary meaning of the word superaddition) is a command of Christ without question. And therefore your *simile* of the *Tridentine Canons* must lye upon your hands : for this is not a place for you to put it off upon your Reader, or your servant (that takes all this paines and drudgery for you, for no other pay but of reproachfull *simile's*) the Author of the Catechisme.

But, O, that this so slight an occasion should, in the midst
of

of another engagement, give you hint or excuse to breake out from hence into that other large field concerning that whole matter of *Christs adding to the Law*! I wish you could have satisfied your selfe with 13 degrees of confutation (which sure you would have done, if any one of them had bene solid, and if number had not been necessary to supply for weight) and not have thought it necessary thus to expatiate. But, Sir, I must not neglect you, or let you passe unattended in any your most casuall notions; But clearly tell you to that whole matter, that I do produce the authorities of, and reasons out of the Fathers (and confesse my selfe so weake as to be inclined, if not convinced by them) to confirme Christ to have improved the Law; and shall not count this to be *imitating a Father in a dangerous expression*, but a full current of Fathers for many yeares, in a cleare pronouncing. And whensoever I shall understand that those testimonies, or those reasons may bee likely to perswade with you, I shall (out of a very ill topickall memory, being farre distant from my Bookes) be ready to produce you some of them. But then though in the *Catechisme* this be done, yet 'tis as clearely there said that no man shall bee contended with in this matter (a little practise of piety with peace, being valuable above a great deale of this kinde of disputing) so hee acknowledge that Christ brought more light, and clearely convinced men of the unlawfulnessse of some things, *which by nature or Moses men had not been convinced to be unlawfull*. Thus much for the Doctrine once againe. As for the superstructure that the Author meant to lay upon it, I shall satisfie your importunity, if it bee but to get you into ordinary charity with him. 'Tis plainly and briefly this; A serious and hearty desire that the utmost that Christs words in that Sermon can safely and properly extend to, may bee now thought by men the duty of every Christian; and that it may not either bee put off (as a counsell of perfection, or a precept for Clergy-men onely, under the stile of Disciples) or bee brought downe againe to the old Law of *Moses*, or the fundamentall of nature, (and being then either not conceived, or not found to bee so severely prescribed there, bee thought fit to bee removed from the Christians shouldders) or else bee taken with some *σφοδρον φριγανον*, which by reconciling it with the latitude thought to be allowed under *Moses*, may take it off

A Copy of some Papers

from all strictness, and so from that height which I conceive now to bee required, and which I desired very earnestly that all men would looke on as their necessary duty, and so try by Gods helpe (and the force of the old *Pythagorean heremistichismos* *ἡρεμιστικὸς νόμος γὰρ ἀνὰ πάντας ὕψους ἐστίν*) whether they might not possibly bee able to performe it. This was the utmost of the superstructure by that Author designed or thought on, and that made mee so wonder (from knowledge of my owne sense, and conscience of my innocent intentions) that any man should say, That *this Doctrine could destroy the summe and substance of the Gospel*; and yet I confesse, I have heard of one other man that hath said that, and perhaps from him you may remember it, and not have ponder'd the truth of it. And so by my *honest saying*, which you call for, you see what spirit of jealousie possesse you, when you fancied such an aereall superstructure for me, which I professe never to have dreamt of, and to wonder at the sharpnesse of your invention, that could bee so prompt for mee; I plainly confesse, That *Christ and his merits is the only cause on which I depend, and expect to bee justified, without the righteousness of the Law*; and the most obedient submission to his most elevated precepts can no more contribute toward justifying mee then the like obedience to the law of nature or *Moses* would have done, if *Christ* were not conceived to have heightened that Law. When we have done the highest that *Christ* requires of us, wee are but unprofitable servants; and by our new obedience have been farre from doing more then was required of us, or making expiation thereby for that which we have not done.

In your third Section of that matter, I grant that which you would inferre from *page 94*. that the Author there produces arguments to confirme that part of the opinion for *new precepts*, and therefore I shall spare reviewing your proofes that hee doth so: but in stead of it, tell you, that after hee hath confirmed it both by a remarkable Scripture, and the reasons given for it by the Fathers, (which concludes their opinion also) yet hee confesses to be content with the acknowledgement of more light; and that hee will not content with any that is contrary minded, so hee will bring the Jewes up to us, and not us downe to the Jewes. Which that it is the expresse doctrine of that Book, you have oft enough been admonished, and can never perfwade any

any man to the contrary, that shall after the places cited by you, have patience to proceed to the rest of that matter.

But now Sir, you begin againe, and would seem to say somewhat against that doctrine;

As 1 that *there was Gospel under the Law, and the Spirit, &c. and divers Jewes penitent believers, and therefore under the second Covenant.* Sir, all this is granted most willingly, and yet Christs comming in the flesh did bring more light, more plentiful effusions of the Spirit, and so might possibly be allowed to give new precepts also.

2 For the *promises*, how plaine they were to the Jews, needed not to bee disputed by him who speaks onely of precepts (save onely as the height or plainnesse of the promises is, amongst other arguments, apt to make higher precepts more seasonable:) and yet that the promises might be cleared by Christ, and made more universally knowne, you will hardly deny or disprove also. For though they were so plaine that they saw them, yet 'twas as farre off, in your owne citation of *Hebrewes 11*, and they that were present to Christ, (who was one of the promises) might sure have a clearer sight of them.

The same will bee answer to your third argument, for that concernes the promises againe: and in that respect 'tis sufficient to adde, that the promises were they never so high before, were now sure clearer under Christ; and that is all that is affirmed by that Author, and will suffice to inferre his concluded obligation to higher obedience.

And so likewise the fourth will be answered, concerning the *Ceremonies*, which I acknowledge to have had some good in them, in order to Christ whom they prefigured; but yet many of them had none in them selves, I am sure none when Christ is come, and hath removed the obligation of them, and so may bee allowed to have added some new precepts in lieu of them: and I am as sure they have not so much of goodnesse or easinesse, the *χρησὶς* ζυγὸς ὁ ἑλαστέρι φορτίου, as now is in the very highest and strictest precepts that are given us under Christ; and therefore there is nothing like unreasonable in the change.

In your fifth, sure 'tis not so strange that I should mention the *pardonings of sinne now under Christ*; for though that was to bee had for the penitent beleever under the time of the *I am* of

Moses

Moses, yet was it 1. Not by the power or purport of the Law, but onely by Christ; And 2. 'twas not at all to bee had in the state of nature, or first Covenant, which required unfinning obedience; and to the Law of nature that law of Christ was said to super-add, as well as to the Law of *Moses*; and therefore that particular in the 95 page, was not impertinent neither, or capable of your sad wonder. But how I am obliged to thinke your question [*Whether there is any veniall sinne?*] tolerably pertinent, or fit to expect any returne from mee at this time, I cannot guesse, yet shall *inwardly*, and answer that also; that though no sinne have any title to pardon under the first Covenant, yet under or by the purport of the second, many sinnes not gotten out of infirmities, &c. shall be washed in Christs blood, and so bee actually pardoned, (which is more then veniall or pardonable in that sence) whereas many other shall never bee capable of that washing, or that pardon, without particular forsaking, but bring them that lye under them (impenitent unbelievers) into condemnation. This were abundantly enough, considering the call I have to the answering of that question at this time. Yet to demonstrate to you that I am not over shy of answering you a question (though it bee of some nicety) when you think fit to ask it me, I will goe a little farther to serve you, and give you the state of this question (if you please, by way of supposition at large) in such a manner possibly that no party will find much to object to it. Thus;

What is the meaning of this ordinary question, [*Can aliquod peccatum sit sua natura veniale?*] will appeare by the answer that must bee given (if it bee satisfactory) to this argument, which I shall imagine produced against it; [No sinne is in its owne nature mortall;] for that sinne should bee the cause of damning any, or that punishment eternall should bee due to sinne, is but an accident that the Law or Covenant of God brought in, either to Adam, *Quo die comederis morte morieris*, or after, *Behold I set before you life and death, &c.* for sure had it not beene for that Law of prohibition (that Covenant with that penalty, on breach of conditions) sinne had never damned any one; and therefore those irrational creatures to whom no such Law is made, and Covenant given, though they should be supposed to sinne against the Law of their creation, they shall not be punished eternally for that

that. Now it is an old rule in Logick, that *Accidens advenit in actu existenti*, and is not *de naturâ subiecti*, though sometimes so ingrafted into it, that it becomes inseparable from it, therefore this [*being mortall or damning*] being an accident that came in by Gods Covenant or Law, cannot bee of the nature of sinne, what ever that sinne bee: For if it were so, then God who cannot make contradictions true, nor consequently take away the nature of the thing and preserve the thing, could not take away the damningnesse of sinne from sinne (any more then quantity from a body) *manente peccato realiter*, which yet wee know God can doe, and ordinarily doth, by pardoning of sinne: for however it may be said by way of answer to that part of the Argument, that Christ suffered and satisfied for sinne, or else God could not pardon any, (not to dispute the truth of that, whether hee could or no) it still remaines that the damningnesse of sin is then taken from sin, by what meanes it now matters not.

This is the Argument I meant to suppose made against that plaine granted truth; and to this argument, hee that had proposed the maine question, and held it negative, if hee will ever answer, must say that the Law and Covenant of God (whether that signifie the eternall Law, or even the eternall will of God, who wills holinesse as hee is God, or in any other motion of Law) is a maine ingredient in the constituting of sin, the very *formalis ratio*, that makes that which is of its selfe materially an act, to become *formaliter* a sinfull act; that makes the killing of a man, which is materially murder, to be also formally the sin of murder; and therefore if by the Law or Covenant of God all sinne bee made mortall, then may it truly bee said in this other notion or respect, or for this reason, that all sinne is so of its owne nature.

This answer must bee acknowledged to bee pertinent and satisfactory, and so any Protestant will receive it: and in stead of excepting against it, I desire to strike in and close with both Disputer and Answerer, and inferre that then it seemes this is resolved on by that party that holds all sinnes in their owne nature mortall, that that is all one with this other proposition [*All sinnes which are by the Law prohibited under paine of damnation, are by that Law damning sinnes, and noneveniall;*] this be-

ing so, I aske the opposite party, that disputed even now, what he thinks of this proposition [*All sinnes which by the Law, or first Covenant were prohibited under paine of damnation, are by the tenure of that Law all damning sinnes, none veniall*] I am verily perswaded hee will consent to it too. And having done so, what hinders now but that this controversie may bee accommodated between disputers, being once rightly explained and understood? For that under the Law, or first Covenant every the least sinne was sufficient to forbid a mans justification, and consequently to damne, is apparently the words of Scripture, *Gal. 3. 9. Cursed is every one that continues not in all.* As for the Gospel, or state of Christianity, or second Covenant, stricken with us in Christ, wee know there is pardon for sinne by the very tenure of the Covenant, and every sin is not now such, as that it shall either damne hereafter, or exclude every one that commits it from the present favour of God, but may bee competible with a justified estate, and a hope of heaven. Gospel-obedience is not perfect, exact, without sinning at all, but onely faithfull, sincere, impartiall, without hypocrisie, or indulgence in any known sin; not the righteousnesse of him that never sinned, but of him that beleeveth on Christ, that repenteth and amendeth his life, that of the new creature, [*Hee that confesseth and forsaketh shall have mercy*] and the like. This was so farre seene and acknowledged by some Papists of the Learned sort, ^a Gerson, ^b Almain, and ^c Jo. Ep. Roffensis, that they have left their opinion in those words to which no moderate Protestant will refuse to subscribe. The two former thus, *Peccatum mortale & veniale in esse tali non distinguuntur intrinsece, & essentialiter, sed solum per respectum ad divinam gratiam quae peccatum istud impurat &c.* The third, *Peccatum veniale solum ex Dei misericordia veniale est.* I have now need to adde no more but this, that if this do not prove acceptable to you, I have lost my labour, especially if it should be matter of any new contention, thus to have been willing to pacifie contenders.

As for your sixth of the [*glimmerings*] and the [*perhaps*] it was a little unlucky, not onely because 'tis said of Christ in Scripture, *in terminis*, that hee was the day-spring to give light to them which sit in darknesse, which is certainly as much as the [*glimmerings*] or the [*perhaps*] can be imagined to import, but

^a Tertia parte
de vit. spirit.
Sect. 1.

^b Quidam. iv. 3.
c. 10.

^c Refut. 32.
utiq. Luther.

but also, because those glimmerings are mentioned by that Author clearly in order to the commands in that place (as appears by the question that induced that answer) and you talke of the discovering of Christ to all the elect for their everlasting salvation, which seemes to mee still to respect the promises; or if it doe also referre to the commands sufficiently discovered under the Law, &c. yet that is nothing against our doctrine, which supposes the former light (for precepts) sufficient *pro statu*, and that men were then saved *non obstante* this want of greater light; and onely require higher obediences now from those that are allowed higher light.

To your seventh, which againe breakes asunder into three under-charges or examinations, there will bee little scruple to tell you, that though the things you mention were required of the Jewes *sub periculo animæ*, *Viz.* beleeve, mortifying lusts, &c.) yet some other things, *viz.* some of the things proposed by Job in his speeches to his friends, by David in his Psalmes, especially by the Wiseman in his Proverbs, &c. might bee but glimmerings of the Gospel-precepts, *αναγκασιαι* to this *ζωωδοτος*, and being 1 Not so strictly and manifestly required of all as the commands of the Decalogue, &c. 2 Not delivered by these as Law-givers, but as wise men. And 3 being not by way of particular precept proposed to all, they might then not oblige them (to whom they were not manifest, or not delivered *sub precepto*) under those hazards under which now the knowledge of our Fathers will by Christ involves us. Besides, I suppose 'tis no newes to you, that there were voluntary oblations among the Jewes in Moses his time, and many acts of strictnesse after, wherein they that obliged all men to performe them, were said to dogmatize: and though for so doing the Pharisees (that did impose them as necessary) were condemned, yet the *סוֹמְרֵי* or *Asidaei*, that practised them, and yet not conceived them necessary, and so never so imposed them on others, were never condemned, but thought fit to be commended and rewarded: and though the Jewes were encouraged to the performance of these *סוֹמְרֵי* or *ἐκνομισμοὶ*, yet is nothing of the doctrine of supererogation infer'd by this neither. But 'tis now impertinent to enlarge on this subject; when all other difficulties that now depend are satisfied. I may chance bee able to give you a justifiable account of that also.

And so how farre soever the Author of the *Cat.* contended for new precepts, yet having exprest what he would bee content with in that matter by way of composition, rather then contend, and saying the very words that I have in that matter transcribed thence, I must bee no more said to recant this second time then that Author did even at the first edition. Who by that one willingnesse to live peaceably with you and all men, must it seems, be condemned to that reproach of having recanted; and be triumpht over, onely because he would not quarrell with every man that is contentious.

And to goe on with you, what if counsells give new light? may not commands doe so too? or must I bee reprehended because I am no Papist? I meane, because I conceive these in *St. Matthew* to bee no counsells, but precepts? I hope, that which I have said will sufficiently rescue mee from any more of your jealousies concerning my weighty superstructures. I have told you my whole heart; you need not use any optick glasse of your own providing to see that which is so naked, and *πλεχνησμένον* before you.

For the second page of your sixth lease, where you are pleased to mention the [*All that you desire*] it is too wanton for mee, to returne any thing to it; I have no leisure to bee playfome, or to consider how poore you are, or how the Critiques have offended you, or what lower heaven they converse in. Onely I hope, I shall not now at last bee condemned for an Antinomian, (because I onely think the whole Law of the Jewes doth not now oblige us) much lesse to goe beyond them, to bee a hyper-Antinomian, for no more then these two plaine assertions, that Christ hath rid us from the sad yoke of ceremonies Judaicall, and will now accept of sincere, though it bee not unfinning obedience. If this Divinity will not please you in any measure, I shall never approve my selfe to you; but yet hope that you doe not thinke in earnest that the Antinomians error is that Christ added higher precepts, or by more light entreated the obligation to obedience above that which the Law required. I suppose you meant that name onely as a *mormo* to fright mee; not that now, because I am no Socinian, I must bee an Antinomian presently.

After the setting downe. the [*All that you desire*] and that
closed

closed as I conceived with a [*finally*] it seemes you have two desires more (and one of them hath many more in it also :) and when your desires doe so increase upon you, I can scarce hope to give you satisfaction; and therefore shall desire to be excused, if I proceed not to them, because some parts of those desires I cannot imagine how I am obliged to answer at all, (as to tell you what grace was brought into the world by the Law of *Moses*, when I make no doubt to acknowledge that grace came by Christ; and as I remember 'twas you (not I) that seem'd to say the contrary, in the top of the second page of your fifth leafe of this last returne, [*The Spirit was administred, &c. during the time of legall administrations*] which yet I would not there quarrell with neither, but think them reconcilable by a commodious interpretation) and other parts are utterly impertinent to any part of our point in hand; as that, Of all mankind's being under the second Covenant, Of Christs satisfying for all, and so of pardon and revelation of the Law of faith to all, (which if it were the thing which brought in all the former, will be easily satisfied, by saying, that what was before so revealed sufficiently *pro statu*, was not yet so fully and clearly as now by the coming of Christ) and so that also of the Aaronicall Priesthood, wherein yet I perceive you conclude strangely against that Author. For sure hee can very well think (what he doth) that Christ can satisfie for sinnes, notwithstanding that the exercise of his Aaronicall Priesthood consists in his sacrifice. For though that sacrifice bee a ceremony of his consecration to his Melchisedechian Priesthood in one respect, yet as a sacrifice (not in the shadow, but) of the substance, as a sacrifice not of the bullock or goat, which indeed can make but a typicall satisfaction, but of the Lambe and eternall Sonne of God, this sacrifice may well expiate and satisfie, and so did indeed. And if you can get the *Socinians* to affirme this also, I shall never quarrell with you, I should bee glad you could thus make them your converts. But sure *Smalcinus's* [*Non est dissimulandum nos non negare Christi mortem ad ejus sacrificium pertinere*] will not come home to it: For they can say this frequently, and yet not think that any satisfaction for sinne was made by any sacrifice of Christ; nor that that sacrifice consisted in Christs death, or was offered by his dying; but expresse the meaning of those words sufficiently, that the death of Christ did onely *pertinere* to that sacrifice which was not offered

up in his death. Which you see is not my sense, but that the death it selfe was a sacrifice, and in it satisfaction made for sinne by the sacrificer. I was afraid a word would not bee enough to every wise man, and therefore I have beene forced to adde this also.

As for your ἀνακαταστάσις of your conquests, you have liberty to use it *ὡς ἀπλάουν*, and triumph as much as you please. For though the [perhaps foolish wanton using of Gods name] (which is not alwaies in oaths) would not restraine from foolish wanton swearing, (and yet me thinks *à majori* it might) yet sure the [sure all prophane, &c.] and the exposition of Christs *μὴ ὅλως ὀμνέειν*, may bee allowed to doe it; and so all had beene safe, and to that matter altogether as cleare, if the [perhaps] had never been blotted out. 2 Christs new precepts will do it, (whether they signifie superaddition of more precept, or more light, which inferres encrease of obligation) and if they would not, I should not by that bee obliged to rest satisfied without them. However, you see I doe not rest so satisfied, but onely tell you what you are to understand by them, and that just agreeably (or *in terminis* the same) to what had beene said before in that Catechisme. 3 For [Christs not forbidding swearing it selfe] you will give me leave to have been long since of that opinion with you, meaning by it, that swearing for Gods glory or the publique good is not forbidden by Christ: and therefore sure the meaning of the answer [A totall universall prohibition of swearing it selfe] was something else, *viz.* of swearing at all by the name of any other beside God, which formerly you might have beleev'd, if you had pleas'd. But I am afraid Sir, you are fallen upon some new notion of [the sinne of dogmatizing.] For to the notion that I alwayes have had of it (*viz.* teaching for doctrines or necessary duties the Traditions of men, or imposing things as doctrines of God, which are not such) 'tis impossible your words can belong. Doe not you meane by the sinne of dogmatizing [transire in dogmata vel sententias aliorum?] I suppose you do, by what follows, of my condescending too passively to take up both opinions. This may possibly bee a slip in you; I shall not upbraid you with it. By what hath now twice or thrice been said, your new argument is superseded; and I am for all my assent to the answer in the Catechisme, verily perswaded that forswearing my selfe for the

publique good were a farre greater sinne then swearing truly in order to that end. But that that Author must still bee forced to have contradicted himselfe, is very hard, when the cleare account of his not having done so hath so oft been given, and cannot yet get a little audience from you. I would, you would bee but so well natured as to tell mee the meaning of your *sc* *nomus* *Ulysses*? and what the designe is that you could so easily guesse at; This plaine dealing would deserve farre more thanks (but indeed not set mee out for so dangerous an undermining designer) then your suspicious speakings, and then affected reservation. Speake out the deepest of your heart; 'twill bee as seasonable, and as just, I suppose, and in all reason as well taken as your question about the weighty superstructure, or your collections in either Sermon.

For your stumbling at my 12 page about *reduction*, I am sorry, and shall labour to keepe you from falling downe right. By telling you, 1 That sinnes forbidden by the same authority, may yet more or lesse clearely bee forbidden by that authority, and under the second of those (*viz.* those that are lesse clearely forbidden) that of reduction may come. 2 That the lesse the clearenesse of forbidding is, the lesse deepe is the obligation to them to whom they are (and 'tis not their fault that they are) lesse cleare: yet of things forbidden by reduction, some are much more clearely forbidden then others; and so fornication, then some other sinnes forbidden by that Commandement: and I suppose you, to whom it is as cleare that fornication is there forbidden as adultery, are as deeply obliged to abstaine from one as other; But then still in other particulars, which are not by the light of the words, nor by any other meanes made thus equally cleare to, some men, to them they are not equally or so deeply obliging.

Then for your [*moreover*] about Christs forbidding swearing by any creature, (which if you had vouchsafed to have taken notice of, you might have left out much that went before) you will sufficiently bee answered: 1 That swearing by any creature will hardly be thought to be forbidden by the Command against taking the name of the Lord in vaine, (because he that swears by the creature doth not directly any such thing) but might perhaps bee better reduced to the former Commandements of not worshipping the creature. 2 I do not believe that any command under the Law
of.

of nature, or of the Jewes, will be produced so cleare, or bee acknowledged so convincing to those that lived before the Law, or to the Jewes, against swearing by some creature, that *Joseph* which is brought in frequently in the story swearing by the life of *Pharaoh*, without any marke of sin on that forme of speech, shall bee resolved to have sinned against conscience in it. And therefore it may at least be granted, that this was of that nature that it might be matter of Christs [*ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὅλως*] and of the Fathers *ἐκ τῆς πορνείας τότε, μετὰ δὲ χεῖρτον ἐστὶ πορνείαν*. And therefore, 4 I must willingly acknowledge, what the Author doth, that a Christian may in no case swear by the creature, and have told you that that was the meaning of that Authors phrase of totall univerfall prohibition, answerable *verbatim* to Christ *μὴ ὅλως ὁμνύειν*.

You are next pleased to proceed to the strife about the word *נֶפֶשׁ*, and 1 to change *Pagnin* or *Mercer* for *Grotius*, and tell me that he will assure mee that *נֶפֶשׁ proprie significat vanum*. Where hee so saith, you tell mee not, nor will I deny it, because I know not what in that place hee may meane by *proprie*: but yet I must tell you, that it was a little unlucky, that I should examine but one Author of your citing; and that should prove so contrary. For I have lookt on that Commandement in *Grotius* his Notes on *Ex. 20. 7.* and there thus you may read, [*In vanum*] i. e. *falso. Non peierabis. Idem n. e. נֶפֶשׁ & נֶפֶשׁ ut in praecepto nono apparet, collato hoc Exodi capite cum altero Deuteronomii, ubi Græci ponunt utroque loco μαρτυρίαν & δόξιν*. This is as plain a testimony as you could have suggested for my turne; and I hope you will now pardon mee, if I abstaine from examining the rest of your citations, being so sure that the granting them all will not prove that Christ said any thing which I may bee ashamed to say after him, when hee rendred the third Commandement *μὴ μενορκήσεις*, and when I acknowledge vaine swearing by Gods name forbidden by that Commandement, and that *נֶפֶשׁ* as 'tis sometimes rendred *falsum* (as by the *Targum*, *Ex. 21. 1.* 'tis paraphras'd by *נֶפֶשׁ mendacii*, and by our English rendred *false*, and so in other places) so it is oft rendred *vaine* also; which is the utmost can bee proved by them. Whereas indeed the word, even when it signifies vaine, hath a peculiar notation of vanity proper to this matter, viz. of a faire empty shew, when in words I seeme to oblige my selfe, but really doe not;

which

which fault is observable in some kinds of swearing, which are therefore clearly forbidden in that Commandement.

As for any *scorne* and *indignation* exprest by me about this matter in my last, though I wondred to see it objected, yet because my memory was fraile, I lookt over those papers (which truly I keep for the like purposes, to decide such differences, that may be incident) and there can I not find one word that looks that way, or that I can imagine could bear that accusation.

For the sense of [*did in effect meane it*] I shall satisfie you; it was that I did meane that which is in effect all one with that other phrase [*were forbidden.*] This you are so kinde to let passe, and with it some few sides more, which I may therefore suppose had no greater difficulties in them, but am farre from taking it ill that you let them passe, but shall assure you that you might as well have past by that also of : *did bol* & *arndin*, which by saying you understand, and by forgiving mee, I suppose you thinke meant by mee against your selfe, to fasten some strange ill character upon you. This I suppose you did by occasion of the meaning of those two words, which are not onely titles of the Devill, but have a significancy proper to them; the one to expresse a calumniator, the other a plaintiffe or adversary *in law*. The former (I confesse) of these, you might with some reason thinke I might apply to you, and perswade your selfe that I can not but beleve you to have been guilty of calumniating mee, *i. e.* accusing mee falsely. But truly Sir, whatsoever I might thinke in that matter, I never meant to say any such thing to you, nor to manage a discourse (designed to a better end) with any passion or asperity, though it were in saying of truth onely. And therefore let mee assure you, I was farre from meaning or saying any such thing of you; and was so little guilty in my owne conscience, that when I found it in your paper, I was a little troubled, till I had somewhat satisfised my selfe with considering that you might possibly be mistaken, and then by looking on the place in my Papers where I finde the passage most cleare from looking towards you. The truth is, I was a speaking of the hurt that might come by teaching that Christ improv'd not the Law, and told you that I could give you an experimentall account of it (Truly that refer'd to a particular person that was then in my minde, and is now in my memory, ready to bee named to you, if you please) in

one that by using that doctrine, and so bringing downe Christ to the perfect law of *Moses*, became an advocate for a vile unchristian sinne. This I made no question was a stratagem of the Devils, accusing to him that Doctrine of Christs superadditions for a false and dangerous Doctrine, and to that end calumniating all Authors for *Socinians*, &c. that were for that Doctrine, and by that meanes fitting him to the justifying of that his vile sinne, which otherwise hee had not probably beene guilty of. This is in more words the plaine of what I then said in those few words, not of Rhetorique, but of plaine sense, and might (if you would) have been excused from the addition and length of this paraphrase.

You lead mee on now to the reviewing of what was said on occasion of the third report.

In that, I see, I have not yet the luck to please you neither, but have offended you more by my excuse then I had done by the first crime; thus unskillfull am I in conversation with men of your temper. This is, it seemes, an error in mee; I am sure, an infelicity. Well, I shall againe endeavour to satisfie you in the reasonablenesse of what I designed, in not disputing with them that thought not all inclinations to evil unconsented to, to bee sinnes; but onely affirming that they were, and rather bringing them to godly sorrow upon their owne principles, then falling to disputation about it. The reason was, and still is, because I foresaw every godly man (I meane, those of whose piety I have no reason to doubt, and that in other things are very orthodox, I am confident, truly humbled for their evil inclinations consented to) was not of your opinion in this matter. 2 Because it is a very nice point, which perhaps for want of cleare stating may bee misapprehended between men of distant persuasions. I will set you a brieve state of it, and leave it to your judgement, whether I speake reason or no. There is in a man a double faculty, to which this inclination may possibly bee applied, either the sensitive appetite common to men with beasts, or the humane will. The sensitive faculty naturally inclines to the pleasurable object, viz. to that which is agreeable to the flesh; that this inclination unconsented to by the man, uncherished, unliked, should bee a sinne, would bee hard to asseme, though you mean by it but originall sinne; because originall sinne is a consequent of

of *Adams* fall, and this was certainly in our first Parents in the time and state of innocence before the fall: as when the apple was so faire to the eye, sweet to the taste, & all 'tis cleare, the eye and taste were then inclined to it; and nothing but the command of God to the contrary could quell that inclination. Suppose then, they had not eaten after this inclination of the carnall appetite to that forbidden fruit, had that inclination in that appetite onely been a sinne in them? 'Tis very probable it had not; the consent, or somewhat else, of the will being necessarily required to make them thus guilty, and I now speake abstracting from any thing of that. Besides this, there is another inclination, viz. of the will, (not a full consent of the will, (or a mixt) to the carnall proposall, but) a bending of the will rather that way then the other; not a weighing downe of the ballance to that side, but an *ἐνεκκλίση* (as that word is contrary to an *ἰσχυρία*, from the word *κλίνειν*, *κλίνω*) a pendulousnesse betwixt the good and the evill, but rather bending toward the evill. This is it that I conceived to bee an aversion from God; not fully, but so farre as that it did rather bend to the carnall object; and this was it that I called a sinne: though being but the inclination of our corrupt nature, and not consented to, I could not call it an actuall sinne. Now the word *præsumptio*, or inclination to evill, being thus an equivocall phrase. I thought not fit to bee severe or importunate upon them who perhaps did not know how to distinguish it, nor againe to trouble a Catechisme with too much nice discourse; but more grossely to bind the Scholar to humble himselfe for all sinnes, distinctly for his evil inclinations, (to that purpose affirming plainly that they were sinnes) or if hee would bee apt to dispute, which might hinder his being humbled,) I meane, dispute upon such a nicety as was mentioned) yet still to call for the conclusion, humiliation, upon his owne principles, if hee would not allow it upon mine. This I conceive, will cleare that Author from any crime in his doubtful expressions, or comivence. For 1 the words are cleare, that inclinations to evill are sinnes; and (if hee will bee taught) that will instruct him in true principles; if he will not, yet will not the [if] following bee a meanes to harden him in impenitence. Nor indeed can I consent to you, that no man can conceive true godly sorrow for his actuall sinnes, who doekt deny the

fountain of all his sins to bee a sin, if you meane by that fountain, the naturall inclination : For I make no question but hee that sees, and fully discernes all his actuall sins, and looks upon them all as progenies of his will, and so his [*ἰμὸν ὕγκλημα, ἰμὸν ὕγκλημα, ἰμὸν μέγιστον ὕγκλημα*] that sees nothing of nature, or necessity, or fault of others in it, but all his owne villany, may have as true godly sorrow for his actuall sinnes, as he would have if hee were sensible of that other also. I say not, that hee would have as much true godly sorrow absolutely, or for all sins ; (for supposing, as now I doe, that hee hath not sorrow for those inclinations as for sinnes. you must not conceive that I say hee hath it save onely as for infelicities) but I or hee may have as true godly sorrow for actuall sinnes, as the other would bee likely to have for actuall sinnes. To which purpose I shall farther venture this one example and proove to you ; Our first parents certainly might conceive true godly sorrow for their first sinne, which was in them actuall, yet must needs deny the fountain of that, and (consequent to that) of all their sinnes (their owne free-will) to have been a sinne or sinfull, unlesse they will accuse their creator, which will bee no proper companion or effect of godly sorrow, and I suppose will not by you bee expected from them. And so I had more reason for my expressions then perhaps you thought of. And so much for your two first objections in that point.

3 For your [*idem per idem*] which you impute to mee, you are much mistaken. For, supposing some inclinations to evill to bee not cherished, the thing that I concluded is, 1 That in that case 'tis victory, not sinne ; And 2 that in that case, I hope you will not say, it is a sinne cherisht or consented to : which, if you marke, was passing an opinion how you must be faine to conclude (and that, a thing quite contrary to your former concluding) and not making any such conclusion for my selfe. You were at great leasure when you observed that illogically probation.

4 For that [*which it seemes, I supposed and proved not*] I must now give you an account. And it was, that I seemed to imply that there must needs be some consent given to actuall sinne, I confesse I then proved it not, but promised to give you an account of it when I had your grounds of scruples, you have now mentioned them to me, *That Originall sinne is truly and properly a sinne in them that are*

not of age to consent to it. 2 That corruption is so strong in us that it doth many times breake forth without our consent. To the first I shall but need remember you, that 'twas every *actuell* sin to which I implied that consent necessary, and I hope you are not ready to prove that *originall* sinne in children (as you call it) is truly and properly *actuell* sinne; and for the second [*the breaking forth of corruption in adults*] that doth (if againe it be an *actuell* sinne) certainly suppose some kinde of consent obtained, whether by sodaine surreption, passion, &c. or by something sometimes that is worse then one act of consent, *viz.* by the custome of sinne, and glibnesse toward it, contracted by many precedaneous acts of consent to it, or the like. Besides, there are two kinds of sinne, *omissions* as well as *commissions*, and there is a criminous consent required to either of them; and hee that is bound to use all diligence to subdue his corruptions, at least to repressse them, if hee doe not so, this indiligence of his hath some of his consent: and that is a prime ingredient in the breaking forth of corruptions; which consequently doe not breake forth without all consent. And for mee now to undertake the prooffe of that, that the Schoolmen upon *Thomas* have so fully proved, that every thing is so farre sinfull or criminous (meaning still *actuell* sinne) as it is voluntary, the yeelding of the will to the sensitive appetite being necessary to the conception of lust; and that againe to the bringing forth sinne, I shall venture the worst of your censure, that I doe not now proceed to demonstrate more largely. For indeed *actuell* sinne being a transgression of the Law, will hardly belong to that faculty, or appetite, which is not capable of receiving the Law: and such is that appetite that hath nothing of the consent of the will in it.

For the complement you charge mee with in the fifth, you had answer in mine to your first and second of this subject.

[*For my mentioning of Socinians*] I confesse I have been guilty of it in these Papers, and I think you know who was the cause of it; and therefore what want of wisdom, or degree of folly soever that is, you should not bee the Author of it in mee, and the punisher also. As for any parallel Doctrines you can finde between mee and them, any farther then is agreeable to sound doctrine, and analogy of Faith, I am not so humble, or so guilty, as to deprecate your threats. As for parallels between our

expressions, 'tis possible you may doe somewhat ; and so perhaps with some study I could doe the like between the Scripture and the Talmud : and to this I would not provoke you (though, I professe I know not yet of any one such) because it seemes in your opinion [*calling the Trinity a speculative mystery*] was one of that kinde, (and I doubt not but at the same rate there are many more to bee met with) and then the provoking you, might let open another sluice or treasure of your Animadversions, wherein the sins of your brethren are laid up, and among them one bundle of these parallels ; and I tell you truly, I shall take little joy in spending so many sheets more in proving those (whatsoever you shall produce under that title) to bee unfit parallels. Yet by the law it is not so well, that you will doe any thing upon a provocation, which you would not doe otherwise : but I confesse this sets no such character upon you, that I should bee willing to provoke you.

In your seventh I confesse to beleeve, that you meant not the Common-prayer-booke by the designed Liturgy, (and cannot imagine why you should thinke I did beleeve you meant it.) And therefore I conceive I inferr'd regularly, that I had nothing to do with that designe, because I desired the continuing of the Common-prayer-booke, and particularly those parts of it which were most incompatible with that designe ; such were the Doxologies, Creeds, Letany, &c. which no *Arian* or *Socinian* would joyne in. And I wonder you should thus mistake so plaine an arguing.

In the eight, where you take care that I magnifie not the *View of the Directory* ; you might have spared your paines, for I can cite a Booke for a matter of fact (and that is all that I doe in that place, by referring you to those places in it, my consent to which testifies my dislike of the designe you speake of) without any kinde of magnifying it. But for the matter so fit for my humiliation, which you observe in that Author, [*The using the suffrage of the Jewes, Heathens, and Mahometans*] that sure will not much tend to your purpose, not onely because those very particulars you pitch on are transcribed (and so profess to bee) out of a Booke of a *Learned member of the House of Commons and your Assembly*, viz. *Mr. Jo. Selden*, but also for these two considerable reasons more ; First, because the suffrage of the Jewes (from whence the other

two are affirmed to have proceeded) doth carry some divine characters upon it, that whole Church and State having peculiar relation to the Theocracy, and so Gods judgement of the lawfulness implied in their practice. And secondly, because the Liturgy of the Jewes was by the Apostles and Christ himselfe made use of, and out of it with some increases and alterations the Christian Liturgies fram'd in the first age of the Church. If I thought it might bee acceptable to you, I would serve you here also, and give you some observations to this purpose (very perfectly and easily reconcilable with what hath been formerly said, but yet) which are not in the View of the Directory, nor yet mentioned in the haste of my former Papers.

'Tis the observation of a noble and a learned French Protestant, that the Apostles were sent, not to destroy but establish that pure worship or service of God which was in the synagogues of the Jewes, which they therefore retained (after Christs example) as farre as did not contradict the ceconomy or dispensation of things under Christ: and therefore though they changed the sacrifices, and the Sabbath, (Christ being the substance adumbrated by one, and the Lords day being appointed to take the place of the other) yet the service it selfe in other particulars they did continue. The grounds of this observation you have in the Scripture: Christ himselfe goes into their synagogues, and the Apostles ordinarily at the houres of Prayers, and certainly joyned with them in their service, as farre as agreed with their present state. And by this meanes some sympathy hath been observable between the Jewish and Christian services. This is cleare by the Jewish formes; for some of which, and for the rites of using them, wee are beholding to a most excellent man (a Protestant also) *P. Fagius*, and to some others since, who have made use of his collections. The first part of their service was a confession of the finnes of their people, (which was alwayes solemnly used in their sacrifices) a rule for which wee have in the sacred Writers, and in the Jewish Bookes the very *verba concepta*, the set constant formes mentioned by that Worthy on the Targum, *Lev. 26*. This they called *confessio* *מִשְׁתָּחָוָה* or *verbalis*; After that followed some Psalmes of *David*, &c. which were sung the whole Psalmes together, as also some *תְּהִלָּה* hymns or gi-

*Du Pleſſ. de
Miff. l. 1. c. 3.*

A Copy of some Papers

vings of thanks, which, say the Jewes, were instituted by *Esdas*, who after the Babylonish captivity restored the service of God. After that they had their lessons out of the Law, which were divided into 54 *Sedarim*, or *Parascosh*, i.e. Sections, as also the lessons of the Prophets distributed into as many *haphtaroth*, or *Aperitura*, or, as some render it, *Dimissions*, so divided that there may be one for every Sabbath in an intercalary yeare. Then again was the whole action concluded with prayer, viz. a generall prayer for the necessities of the Church and State, publike and private, and in that many particulars. After these prayers the *Archisynagogus* blessed the people, and dismiss'd them. Save onely that on any great festivall solemnity, the Passeeover, &c. there followed Benedictions particular to the occasion, which on the Passeeover were pronounced by the mouth of the master of the family; a forme of which, *Miserere Domine*, &c. we have in *P. Fagus* on the Targ. *Dent*. 8.

Some vestigia of this practise of theirs, in each part, wee have in the New Testament; Of their confession (saith that noble learned man) *Mat*. 3. 6. *Mar*. 1. 5. *Acts* 13. 38. Of their lessons *Acts* 15. 21. *Acts* 13. 14. *Luke* 4. 18. Of their psalmodes and hymnes, *Ephes*. 5. *Col*. 3. where 'tis observable that the three words of Greeke used by the Apostle are the very same which are used by the Septuagint to render the three Hebrew words used in the Old Testament, and so referre particularly to the practise of the Jewes. Of their prayer for necessities (saith hee) in the Lords prayer *Mat*. 6. which, with him, some other very learned men conceive to have had speciall reference to the *formula solennes* then among the Jewes; Of their prayer for the Common-wealth, and all that were in place of power over them, 1 *Tim*. 2. 1. which words there in *St. Paul* ('twas *St. Augustines* affirmation) were *nominatim intelligenda de solennibus Ecclesiastici officii precibus*, &c.

* *Primi Christiani huic officio se accommodarunt*. Morn. de miss. l. 1. ca. 4.

4 For the practise of the first * Christians, how agreeable 'twas to this practise of the Jewes, will bee easily discerned. *St. Basil* in the description of a Clergy-man officiating, *ad Cler. Casar. Ep*. 63. They goe, saith hee, to the house of prayer, and after the confession, they prepare for the *Laudus*, singing of Psalmes, (speaking of the first Apostolicall times; for now, saith he, we sing the Psalmes in parts, or by turnes: it seemes they had not done so before, but all together) and by the intermixing of prayers, and interchange

terchange or variety of Psalmes, and hymnes, they overcome or spend a great part of the night speaking of the *antelucani conventus* and alsoone as the day breaks, they offer to God the Psalm of confession, and so dismisse the Assembly. Besides the lessons out of the Old Testament, the Christians (you will beleewe) added also others out of the new; and (saith *Morney*) *ejus particulam aliquam Antistes interpretari solitum.*

After Sermon they proceeded to the celebration of the Eucharist (parallel to their customes on the great Festivities of the Passover, &c.) In it, 1 the words of the institution were recited, with a thanksgiving or blessing, (as in *Iustine Martyr*'s described) then the bread and wine (before received by the offertory of the people) was distributed to the people; after which a Psalm was sung, &c. Before the Sacrament, saith St. *Ambrose*, was the prayer for Kings, *Et hac regula ecclesiastica tradita à magistro gentilium*, saith hee, *de Sacra. l. 4. c. 4.* and of the use of that also *Tertul.* is expresse, *Apol. c. 39.* After the Lords Supper the *τεισιζμον* or Doxology was taken up in imitation of Christ, who after Supper sung an hymn with his Disciples, not disdaining to make use of the ancient Jewish custome. One testimony more I shall onely adde out of St. *Cyprian de Orar. Dom. Ser. 8. Publica nobis est & communis oratio, &c.* [Publicke common Prayer] *pro toto populo oramus*, for all the people, (as among the Jewes for all Israel; & we for the whole Church, especially for Kings.) And that men may minde nothing but that their present employment, *Ideo sacerdos prefatione parat fratrum mentes, dicendo, Sursum corda, ut dum respondet plebs, Habemus ad Dominum, moncatur nil se nisi Dominum cogitare debere.* I shall trouble you no longer then to desire that the Liturgy lately used in this Church may be compared with the severalls here mentioned, from the Jewes first; and after, the Apostolicall Christians: and as you will finde the generall forme exactly continued in Confession, Psalmes, Lessons, Hymnes, Prayers for all the Church, especially for Kings, &c. (and no reason to doubt but that sometimes the very words were continued also; assuredly set Forms then, as now, as appears by the *Sursum corda*, and *Habemus ad Dominum*; *Lift up your hearts, Wee lift them up unto the Lord*) So it was not without reason that the Author of the *View* thought fit to draw one argument of many from the practice of the Jewes; to which the other two of the *Mahometans* and *Heathens* come in *ex natura*

turali sequela, but as rivulets and derivations from that fountain.

But then besides these suffrages, you know there are in that *View* many other arguments produced which may chance to bee more concluding to you. And though a mans arguments (as our own prayers) may serve the turne, yet the suffrages of others will do no hurt also. If the point in question, which you say you have shewed mee, be that which in this Paper you formerly mentioned, you may in my answer to that satisfie your selfe that you were not very lucky in shewing. Before I part with this section, let mee beseech you to tell me, whether 'twere onely a fault in your memory; that when you were pleased to tell me what you said at *Carfax* against the Author of the Catechisme, you did not please to name this particular of the Mahometans, &c. especially when I am told that you cited it as a worke of that Authors who made the Catechisme, and spake pretty tragically about that subject.

9 For your contempt of my mention of Doxologies and Creeds, it is not so very seasonable, because being mentioned onely in order to prove that I was none of the designers of the new complying Liturgy, you cannot but say that they were pertinent to that purpose. And for your prooffe, *That Doxologies and Creeds may be left out, because the Directory takes in the whole Scripture for a Liturgy, and there are Doxologies and Creeds enough in the holy Scripture* [it is a kind of arguing that I confesse I understand not; for sure for all that, (or granting the Scripture to containe, as you say truly, all necessities to salvation) it will still remain true, that serving of God and worshipping him by praises, confessions, and professions of our Faith, may bee allowed to bee duties of such a value, that if they doe not deserve to bee brought in, yet 'tis not necessary they should utterly bee cast out from the service of God. For your Confession of Faith which you say shall be published by your Assemblers, if that bee to bee used in the service of God, then must there bee some new direction for it put into the Directory, and then perhaps the Creeds of the Ancient Church might have continued there as well. If it bee only for other uses, you know it belongs not to the point in hand. And which way soever, you know it concludes not against any thing that I was about to inferre from Creeds, &c.

10 For the question you there put, you do it I suppose but sportingly. For if you will needs have a question, the only one that can be pertinent to the matter there in hand (or which will be betwixt things of any like nature) is that which is there set, betwixt the using the Common-prayer-book in each part of it and the putting it wholly (or in those so many mentioned parts of it) out of the Church: and then sure the so many obstacles to *Socinian* errors being retained in one, and turn'd out in the other, the vote will be quickly resolved on. As for your desired parallel, the Cat. or the Directory, I suppose you doe not expect I should speake to that, yet that which countenances no one *Socinian* error, and I thinke either profestly, or *ἐκ μαθήσεως*, discountenances every *Socinian* error, will bee able to compare (in that matter of countenancing them) with any other Writer in the world. For though it were granted, that it doth not so much discountenance them as other Books that are written particularly against them, yet not countenancing them at all, it doth as much not countenance them, as any other thing can bee imagined to doe. But

Now 'tis a little wearisome to mee to see this 10 Sect. againe breaking asunder into questions, which you might so very well have spared. For sure Sir, 1 I no where had said in these Papers, *That the Direct. had commanded all to sit at the Sacrament*; I had onely spoken of the Protestants in Poland forbidding sitting, because it complied with the Arians. 2 I had also no need to say, *That all familiarity inferr'd an equality*; 'tis enough to me, that humility and distance, kneeling, &c. is more like to bee an argument of inequality, and an expression of it. 3 [*That Socinians thinke themselves equall with Christ, &c.*] I have no need to affirm, having onely urged a matter of fact, which stands good without it, because that familiarity in sitting at the Sacrament will bee more agreeable to their notion of Christ as a meere creature, then kneeling will be; and that is all was to be proved from it, and not that the *Socinians* equall themselves with Christ. As for my saying, *That Christ did not blesse us till after his resurrection*, (which perhaps you repeat out of the way, to set some ill marke upon it) 1 I pray remember that they are the plain words of Scripture, *having raised his Son Jesus, he sent him to blesse us, &c.* and I hope 'twill bee no huge fault to say what *Socinus* doth, when if hee doe say it, hee saith the same with Scripture. 2 That you may mistake the meaning

of that phrase; and thinke, as some doe, that for Christ then to begin to blesse, is for him then to begin to have divine power: but sure you know that is not my meaning; but that Christ may be considered in respect of his natures, or of his offices, *i. e.* in respect of the *οικονομία* Or *Προβίονος*, as the Fathers use it; and that 'tis onely in that latter respect that all power is then said to be given unto him, and so this of *blesing*, and at last to be resigned up to the Father: which will not at all hinder the renouncing of all *Socinian* or *Arian* heresies in the businesse of Christs eternall Divinity, or of the Trinity. By this you see what an ill parallel you had fetcht out of *Smalcus*, and I must suppose most of your others are such.

For your argument offered me for the Liturgy, I am not merry enough to receive, or reward you for it, (and you know, my businesse in hand is not to asser the Liturgy; that is *ἱερίαις οὐκ ἔστιν*; but the demonstrating that I was none of the men for the new designed Liturgy) onely let mee tell you, that the easinesse and pleasantnesse of the Liturgy was not thought to consist in the easinesse of the task for the Minister, for I do not perceive that the Directory-way, as 'tis exercised, hath any whit lesse of that ease in it) but in respect of the Auditors, who can goe on in their duty with more ease and pleasure: and sure duty is not naturally so acceptable to all men that there is any necessity of making it more tedious, toylsome, (especially if it be added, as you say it is) and lesse profitable, then was necessary. And therefore you may perceive for all your scoffes, that Orators arguments (if the author of that *View* were guilty of that faculty) even those that you pick out for the very worst, may have somewhat beside Rhetorique in them. I am sure this which you mention, is more proper and effectually to inferre the conclusion, then the fetching that argument out of that Book, to expose and shew it openly, was to the question in hand, whether I was in the designe for the new complying Liturgy. But I have learnt to passe by all such Sarcastmes and impertinences, I hope, with some tolerable patience.

Now then you say you hasten to my discourse of *Godly sorrow*; I beseech God to give each of us our part of it.

In that, you begin with a challenge to mee, to prove that which you know was proved already, if explaining a thing,
and

and laying it before you in such a manner that you doe not (I conceive, cannot) deny any part of it, may bee called the proving of it. Your second is but a repetition of what was said by mee; yet hath some art in it, depriving it of the prooffe that was brought for it, that it might looke the more naked, and despicable. Your third was discreetly order'd to scoffe at what was said, for a *dictate* and *admirable*, (which was neither, but a plaine evident truth, that the impurity of our humane condition, may bee matter of godly sorrow to any, though not meerely *quâ* an infelicity) and you aske againe whether it bee godly sorrow to grieve for an infelicity? I say againe, such the infelicity may bee (particularly that now spoken of) that it may bee matter of Godly sorrow, or *λυπη γὰρ τοῦ θανάτου* (and be otherwise described in a gracious stile of loving the appearance of Christ, which may rid us of our impurities) and yet not bee this *quâ* *sic*, meerely as an infelicity; which was all that was needfull there to bee inferr'd.

In your fourth you mention your opinion, that all pollution of the soule of man hath been by sinne onely. But sure Sir, this doth not prove every pollution to bee a sinne; but, as your words import, an effect or consequent of sin.

Next, you pronounce that I am much mistaken: and your proof of it is *petitio principii*, a begging, *i. e.* not proving, yet assuming the thing before in question (and prov'd on the other side by mee, both before and now in the last Sect.) *viz.* That no man grieves for a sinne after a godly manner, but hee that grieves for it as a sinne against God. When you know, that by that one instance of the impurity of our nature mourned for by him that tooke it not for a sinne, but onely a thing that rendred him 1. imperfect; then 2. prone to sinne; and 3. lesse amiable in Gods sight, &c. (with an addition of wishing and praying to bee dissolved, and bee with Christ as farre better) the contrary was undeniably inferr'd; and no answer offered by you to these premisses. For the undeniable grounds of repentance, I suppose they are laid in that Cat. both by requiring it for all sinne, and by naming inclinations to evill in the front of sinnes, without [*ifs* or [*ands*] or any dubious expressions. But yet after all your severity in giving your advice for the designing of a Catechisme, I conceive your inference, in the name of the *Acute wretch*, was

farre from any acutenesse: for sure whatever were resolv'd about inclinations being no sinnes when unconsented to, 'twould never follow for your Client, *Ergo, the like acts, to which he is naturally inclined, are not evill.* For sure Sir, the acts may bee allow'd sinnes (and not bee excus'd by our being naturally inclined to them) whatever were conceived of the inclinations. The conclusion from your premisses could onely bee this, *Ergo* this and that act, being naturall also, are not evill. And if your wretch should conclude so, you would soone bee able to inform him that his acts are not naturall, and therefore may be allow'd to be evil though he be naturally inclined to them, because it is very evil not to resist and deny those inclinations.

You then goe off in triumph with a [*You know what I could adde.*] Truly Sir, I professe I doe not: and yet whatever 'tis, if it bee like this you have allow'd mee, I should consider it perhaps in obedience to you, but never be much wrought on by it. Yet shall I excuse this for the good news it brings with it, being a transition to the fourth report, another stage toward the end of my very wearisome journey.

In that, you have begun with many little particulars which want of truth; particularly, that I make a second acknowledgement that I was mis-informed, when I onely professe that by your discourse I cannot discern whether I was in this mis-informed or no. It seemes you are willing to receive acknowledgements of mistakes: you would otherwise thinke it more pertinent to tell mee whether in either Assembly you insisted on that particular or no. For an answer to your *quere's*, you sure perceive (though you complaine for want of it) that I gave you that whole sense of my soul in that point, not onely by that meanes to bee sure to tell you my opinion of your then present *quere's*, but also of all others of that subject that 'twere possible for you to ask. And by this time I conceive you do discern that I am neither very forward to make *quere's* to divert, &c. nor to deny answer to them, when they are made.

About the first proposition you mention, though you stand not to ask [*why acceptation is put for pardon?*] 'Twere no great matter if I said 'twere *de industria*, on this head, because God first accepts the penitent person in Christ, and then after (in order of nature, though not of time) hee pardons his sinnes: though indeed

deed 'tis true againe, that the finnes are pardoned in order of nature before the acceptation of the *actions*; I meane, of all the actions of the subsequent life. But then there is a double acceptation, of the person first, and then of the actions; of *Abel* first (as the Fathers observe) and then of his offerings. Which yet I hope, will not passe with you for the double justification; but this *ex abundanti* also.

But to your maine question (for I must now wholly deale in the old trade of answering questions: which I have been told is the farre easiest way for him that wants other provision, and yet would faine not make an end of disputing) *Why I speake of remission and acceptation, and leave out imputation?* Sure 'tis, partly because acceptation of the person, and so pardon also, includes *imputation* of Christs righteousness, as the formall cause of our justification; God accepting of Christs *λυτρωσις* or payment (which is imputation of his sufferings by way of *ἀντιπρόστατον* for us) and then accepting our persons, and pardoning our finnes; partly, because one kinde of imputation is after our pardon of sinne in order of nature, a distinct thing from it, and so needed not to bee there spoken of, as belonging rather to our sanctification, for the completing or filling up the imperfections of that; I meane now the imputation of Christs perfect obedience to that penitent beleever whose finnes are pardoned by the sufferings of Christ: for to such a one Christs perfect obeying the Law may so farre bee imputed as to give a glosse or tincture to his still imperfect obediences, so farre as that they shall bee accepted by God; Which imputation therefore may bee antecedent to, and have to doe with that acceptation of actions, but yet in order of nature bee after the acceptation of persons, and forgiveness of finnes. But the truth is, I then meant to give you plaine grosser propositions to prevent mistakes and disputes, and not to descend to such nicer distinctions as these.

But truly you were very wary, when you laid such an observation on the [*This*] in the second proposition, which sure was an innocent particle of reference looking back to the Antecedent [*justification*] in the former proposition, and meaning it in the very same latitude that theret had been used, for the entire, not partiall (or first, or one part of) justification. *To* let this passe, when you had taken notice of it, was not an act of

of charity, but justice in you, yet that which would have beene very welcome to mee many times. For just from as true or solid ground as this, have many of your other exceptions sprang up, and have not so candidly beene laid downe by you.

To your next questions, which you professe to aske, that mistakes may bee prevented, upon that account, I professe to answer most cheerefully; for I see how wearisome a thing it is to have been mistaken.

To your first quære [*Why the grace of God in justifying, &c. doth not extend to every man for whom Christ hath satisfied?*] I answer clearly, because Christs satisfaction is not *absolutely* for all, or that they may bee pardoned whatever they doe, how infidel or impenitent soever they continue; but *conditionally* for all, and thereupon that grace of justification extends to none but those who performe the *Condition*.

For your second 'tis very nice (and might sure have beene spared in this businesse) That *because God hath been affirmed by me to require regeneration as a condition to justification, therefore I must tell you what condition God requires unregenerate persons to performe, that they may attaine unto regeneration.* To question thus were infinite, and to this matter of justification utterly unnecessary. But yet I shall not faile you in any thing; He satisfie you in that also. God requires in the unregenerate man *τὸ ἐμπρόσθεν τῆς ἡμετέρας, as the Ancients expresse it, a readinesse to obey his call; not to resist, but receive his grace, when hee bestows it on him; and having received it, what degree soever it bee, to cherish, and make use of it; and this by his grace, God enables him to doe.*

As for your demand of mee, by way of retribution, that I must grant that God doth justifie the ungodly, *i. e.* the man that is guilty of many sinnes, I make no question of that, if hee bee a penitent, and so may hee bee, and yet bee called *ἀγαθός* still, in the sense that I conceive belongs to that word, *Rom. 4. 5.* that is, *ὁ μὴ ἐργαζόμενος*; not one that continues impenitent in sinne, but one that neither hath nor doth performe exact, perfect, legall obedience: which is very reconcilable, if not the same, with what you confesse, [*That God never justifies an impenitent infidel in sensu composito, i. e.* never any that is then infidel or remains impenitent.

To your third I answer, that there is such a condition, which doth to qualifie the subject, that I can say, by it, and onely by it I am justified, *i. e.* by it onely as a condition, not including any causality in it. And if you will know, what that condition is, you have been oft told already, and I now tell you, *Faith in the nation wherein it signifies a receiving the whole Christ, and contains in it a resolution of obeying Christs Commands, as well as of depending on him for mercy.* And on supposition, or condition that you grant that, and so speake of faith as *πιστις* *ἡ ἐν ἡμῖν*, and *πίστις* *ἡ ἐν ἡμῖν*, I will speake with you in the dialect of the first sort of the men you mention, and say that faith is required to receive the object of justification, Christ, &c. but withall adde, that it is required as a condition too, to dispose or qualifie the subject, and that without this condition, no man living shall bee justified. Which being premised, it shall not yet follow from thence that by this he shall bee, sa you say, constituted righteous, if by [*constituted by*] you attribute any causality to this qualification, or any thing but that of being a condition by which hee is justified, *i. e.* is not justified without it. And so this is as plain as I can devise too; and mee thinks there should bee no mistake. For in the sense wherein I have now exprest my selfe, I doe again consent to your conclusion, *that God doth by his free and effectual grace worke in the hearts of his elect to receive Christ, (that is, the whole Christ) that they may be justified, not by their owne obedience, or vow of obedience (as by a cause) but by obedience of Christ alone freely imputed by God, and rested on by faith onely:* It being one act of that faith by which the just doe live, to have assistance, or rest on Christ.

In your [*moreover*] it may also bee true, that there may be some difference between disposing the subject to salvation and to justification: as the cordiall habit of faith, and sincere vow, may dispose to justification; and, in case of living to occasions and opportunities, the acts of faith and actual performances will bee required; yet so that he that is disposed for justification, if he should then presently dye, were disposed to salvation also. Which notwithstanding I shall also add with you, 1. That there is faith required, to receive the object, Christ, *Iehova* our righteousness; and grace prerequired, to enable thus to believe; and obedience to, or making use of that grace (the *ἔργον* *τῆς πίστεως*, Heb. 12. 18.) a condition

A Copy of some Papers

dition required in us, to that end that grace may have its perfect worke on us, And a that *all the acts and habits of grace, which are in the best men concurring together, are not sufficient to justify a man before God.* And therefore faith concurring so, with such a vow, or with faithfull actions, cannot justify us. This I write out of your Paper, as fast as I can drive, (and, by the way, you see some difference betweene our tempers; I consent to as much of yours as possibly I can, and labour to take as few exceptions; you on the contrary have another method in reading them that you are not kinde to) and consent to it most fully at first sight, and never remember to have doubted of it, since I considered Divinity. But for your addition, [*Off faiths justifying relatively*] you must give mee leave not to take that into my forme of Doctrine (being not very intelligible) but to use my owne expressions, as conceiving them more perspicuous, and commodious to the notions I have of this matter, *viz.* Thus, that *Christ onely justifies, Faith receives Christ, but yet still by no way of causality justifies; is causall indeed in receiving Christ, but onely the condition in justifying; because, though receiving is an act of ours, and in us, yet justification is an act onely of Gods upon us, and concerning us.* Which in effect you yeeld also, when you say, that [*Faith cannot pardon sinnes or accept.*] For then it cannot justify. At this time me thinks we are excellently well agreed, I wish it may long continue.

But then in the next words, wee are out againe; I am now lookt on as one that *abuses Scripture for the maintenance of errors*, whereas God knows 'twas no more but citing the words in St. James, *faith consummate by works*, as a parallel place to faith *impyetish & dryden* in St. Paul, and let the Papists say what they wil, (and abuse that or any other place) sure this is no *abusing Scripture for maintenance of errors*. But then what you meane by your not dreaming, that I thought Abraham was justified by the actual sacrifice of his Sonne, I cannot dreame or imagine; certainly I never said any such thing; or if you thought I meant that by works, you are much mistaken: but onely I conceived the resolution of sacrificing to have been accepted by God, to his justification, without actual sacrifice him.

But then Sir, in that which follows, when 'tis resolved that we are agreed in the conclusion, 'tis very strange that that will not.

not satisfie you without some retraction. O how much a more pleasant thing is victory then peace ! Sir, I must tell you confidently, all that that Author ever hath said in the *Catechisme* is perfectly reconcileable with this conclusion; (and hee may chance to bee as fit to judge of the importance of his owne words, as any man else) and therefore still *retraction* must be spared, unlesse you please to *retract* causelesse displeasures. But that it seemes you will not suddainely doe : for againe you are deepe in a questioning over againe, what hath beene so often answered, and profestly acknowledged. I shall proceed to doe it over againe once more. 1 I say, that wee are not justified by any thing in us, *i. e.* either by vow of obedience, or faith, save onely as by a condition, or *causa sine qua non* ; and in that sense, by both of them together wee are justified. But then you have an objection to those words of mine [*The condition must bee undertaken before the the Covenant belongs to mee*] and say in your third, That if by Covenant I meane the whole Covenant of grace, I must make some condition goe before our regeneration also. I answer, that the word *Covenant* there in that place, signifies any one part of the whole *Covenant*, which depends on the performance of any proportionable part of the condition, and so needs not belong in that place to *regeneration* also, but may bee restrained onely to that of justification. Yet for the condition prrequired to regeneration also, I have given you my sense formerly, and need not so soone repeat it to you.

4 For the third [*you know*] I professe not to know how they belong to me, or any interests of mine.

5 That to receive forgiveness is an *act* of faith, I shall againe acknowledge, so you conclude not from thence that it justifies by so doing. But that I ever said, That wee receive a pardon by an *act* of charity, &c. I shall not yet be perswaded, nor can that proposition have any truth, any otherwise then that charity is part of the condition, without which that Pardon shall not belong to me, (which were a very ridiculous ground of saying, that wee receive our pardon by that *act* ; because [*receiving by*] notes an efficiency, and of that there is none in a meere condition.) Sir, I am confident I never said these words, and therefore I cannot well forget them.

As for your citation out of the page 28. of the *Cat. Tho*

A Copy of some Papers

a man is justified by faithfull actions, and by them onely. That you must understand (as 'tis there clearely set in the case of *Abraham*) in case there be a present opportunity to exercise the faith. For though when such occasions are not present, the faith which consists *in voto*, the full resolution, the cordiall receiving the whole Christ, will serve the turne, without any actions; yet when the occasion is present, the action must bee ready, or else the faith will not justifie. And therefore though in this case of such opportunities, I plead for more then the bare vow, as necessary to justification, yet still 'tis true that I plead for no more in any other case; and even in this I can content my selfe with this vow, if it bee sincere; nor will God acknowledge it so, if it act not in time of tryall; when the opportunity is offered. And so, *sure I am well enough off from a first and second justification.* For all, that I require by way of condition, is the sincere receiving of Christ in heart and resolution; which if it bee sincere, will fructifie in its due season; and if it be not such as will doe so, 'tis not fit to bee accepted by God to our justification.

But for your arguing on the other side, That *if wee are justified by a vow of personall obedience*, then wee are not justified by *Christ alone, or by faith onely*; that is but the old Sophisme, so oft laid open, by our confessing nothing to have to doe with our justification but Christ, as the *cause* of our justification, or that which constitutes us righteous; and for our vow of obedience and faith, that is onely as the *condition*: granting still faith to receive the pardon, but not thereby to justifie.

And so once more I will agree with you, that is, with that concluding proposition of yours, whether you will permit mee, or no; and doe it now againe without any need of the least syllable of retraction.

Thus have I attended you a most wearisome journey, being scarce permitted to passe over any line in your Papers without answering some either mistake, or question of yours. And truly I have served you freely and faithfully, and that hath swell'd it to a bulke beyond what in any reason I was bound to pay you. And if you doe not please that there shall arise to mee some fruit by all this by your discerning and acknowledging the causelesse of your exceptions, yet if you please, let us put it to others to judge between us; for 'tis possible wee may judge amisse of our
own.

owne performances. And therefore by your good leave (as before I told you) I shall bee willing the world shall judge between us, or as many of them as shall bee fitted with great patience to sit out the hearing of so meane an Act. If this course will not please you, but you thinke good to write back againe. I shall take confidence to expect (what is most just) that you return *ad punctum*, or *ad carceres* from whence we set out: and which soever of your publique charges upon that Author seemes to you to remaine unsatisfied by my returnes, let it bee specified, and your reasons joyned with your expressions of dislike; such as you thinke will destroy the grounds, and bee directly and clearely opposite to the state of the question on which I build. And having now twice submitted to such punctuall answering of so long a catalogue of questions, let mee, I pray, bee freed from any more of that taske. For I know when all other things are at an end, there will never bee any end of them. There is a very unhandsome English proverbe to that purpose; Let mee beseech you; not to fall under any suspition of being guilty of it: and as you might justly accuse mee, if I applyed it to you, so I beseech you to see that it bee not applyable. Yet let mee tell you, *When these controversies now depending are at an end, there is no one question concerning any line in those Bookes so paradigmized by you, or in any piece of Divinity, wherein I understand ought, but you or any man shall for the least asking have the full sense of*

Wednesday Nov. 4.

Your Servant

H. Hammond.

SIR,

YOU have sent mee many sheets: and the onely conclusion that I can pick out of them, *is an English Proverbe; and that but intimated*; truly Sir, if I being a foole have ask'd more questions then you in your wisdom are able to answer, I am ashamed of my folly, and you need not glory in your wisdom; yet such, it seems, is your high conceit of your owne wisdom, that you do passionately long to publish your wisdom to the world in print. Sir, I shall not license any Papers of yours that I have as yet received; and you may see cause hereafter to thanke mee for it: nor will I desire you to license so much as an *a.* of mine. But it seemes you cannot thinke of any other way of satisfaction for that injury which you conceive hath beene offered to you by your Friend (for so I call every man that deals plainly with mee,) and give me leave as a friend to advise you to be ware lest the satisfaction which you gaine by getting into Print, benot as imaginary as the injury which hath beene offered to you, by the repeated yet necessary admonitions of

Nov. 15. 1646,

Your humble Servant

Francis Cheynell.

If you thinke fit to object any thing against mee in Print, I doubt not but by Gods helpe to give all that are impartiall full satisfaction, as soon as my more weighty employments will permit.

Sir,

SIR,

YOur Letter of return to my last I received not till this morning (though it were dated on the Lords day was seven-night :) and with it an advertisement that Mr. W. whom you appointed to convey my former to you, was gone to London before it came to mee. So that, although I know not how this paper will make shift to finde out the way, yet can I not but addresse it toward you, if it be but to take the leave of you a little solemnly, and to professe that I designe not any farther trouble to you on this matter, having beene assured by you of the unprofitableness of my former paines; and having little hopes, that any more will prove more fortunate then those eight or nine sheets, *out of which you tell mee you can pick but one conclusion, viz. an English proverb*, and *that but intimated*. Sir, I am very unhappy if I have written so much so unconcludingly: but cannot bee so severe to my selfe, and those papers, as to imagine that it was not in your power to have *pickt* out some others, (had they beene for your turne to take notice of them) as easily as that one which you acknowledge was *but intimated*. It seemes, your notes tend all to finding of faults; and so this came into your observation. I shall not from hence conclude that this was the onely thing you had reason to dislike in those papers; Onely I must say that your reasons of disliking this particular of the *English proverb*, as farre as it was mentioned by mee, are by no meanes concluding; and to make them appeare such, you are faine to affix a sense on my words very distant from that which the contexture of them is capable of. For Sir, that you have yet appeared to bee a *foole*, or that I undertake to have any *wisdom*, or have any need to doe so (the innocence of the cause which I have in hand being sufficient to supply that place) or that you have asked mee *more questions then I am able to answer*, I had no way.

way so much as *intimated*; but on the contrary, had for the time past answered all your very many questions, or shewed you (as in some few) how unne cessary it was to the matter in hand, to answer them; and yet promised you farther, That *when the controversies now depending betwixt us were at an end, there should bee no question concerning any line in those bookes, or any piece of Divinity wherein I understood ought, but you should for the least asking have my full sense or answer.* All that that mention of the proverbe could signifie, was this, that I desired you would take care hereafter not to fall under any suspection of being guilty of it; which was but a circumlocution of this plaine sense, that if you returned any thing to those sheets, I desired it might bee *ad punctum*, without asking any unnecessary questions, because that would bee a way unworthy of any Scholar, and would bee infinite. And if I should have told you plainly, that if you should doe this, you would, by the force of that proverbe, bee found guilty of *folly*, and possibly pose a man *wiser* much then my selfe, this would not have amounted to any of the three things by you concluded from my Letter. Yet is all this as truly said by you as what you next adde; That *I passionately long to publish my wisdom to the world in print.* The rudenesse of this scoffe shall be pardoned by mee. I shall onely speake to the truth of it. I had no such opinion of the worth of any thing, that would bee pertinent answer to your exceptions, as to have any passion or longing to have it printed; I onely told you, That if you could not yet acknowledge the causelesnesse of your exceptions, by your leave I should bee willing the world should judge betwixt us: and in one other place, When you had bid mee venture your arguments to any reader, affirming that you feared none, I thought it seasonable to tell you that I expected according to the purport of your speech, that you would give your consent that this whole matter should bee referred to others judgment, and to that end Printed. I suppose, neither of these speeches imply either passion or longing after the presse; And truly Sir, as long as there are such Readers abroad as you, I thinke a man in prudence ought before-hand to bee assured of their kindnesse, ere hee have much appetite to bee in print. The short

short is, I was and am most willing to submit the dispute between you and mee, and the truth of this question [whether you have wronged mee or no,] to any or all reasonable men; and having offered it successlesly to you, I am still ready, if you consent, to make it more publique; and shall not consider any interests of my owne so much, as to retract my offer. You say, *You shall not license any papers of mine which you have yet received*: and then, I suppose, you are confident they will not now bee licensed in this place; and it will onely bee in my power to take care that this bee the last you shall receive. Onely I shall adde (without expressing any longing) that if you will license your owne, you shall not need to trouble your selfe in desiring mee to license mine, or to give my consent that they bee licensed. As for your advice to the contrary, I know not from what degree of kindnesse it proceeds: and having some reason to beleve that there is nothing in them against piety, or charity, perhaps you may bee mistaken, if you thinke your not licensing them will ever deserve thanks from mee; any more then that which you call an act of friendship, doth, viz. *your having dealt plainely with mee*. To which give mee leave to answer, that friendship is a strange thing, and very distant from Christian charity, if it bee any thing like those publike reproaches which you laid most causlesly upon the Author of the Catechisme in your Sermons. Assure your selfe, if I were now in the temper of minde, in which you were when you did that, (and it seemes, now continue to bee) I would presently send all your papers to the Presse with my answer to them; and tell you, I was in this your friend. But I have other employments for my thoughts, and other motives and principles of not revenging injuries, then those which you offer mee by way of friendly advice to beware, &c. Which perhaps may intimate something of terror. I shall for the present sit downe with full patience and satisfaction of minde, that I have driven this businesse thus farre: and till your more weighty employments permit you to consider mee, as my paines to

A Copy of some Papers &c.

serve and satisfie you deserve from you, I take my leave of you,
and rest.

Nov. 23. 1646.

Your very loving Friend

H. Hammond.

I would you had signified your pleasure positively, that I should not permit to any mans eyes, what you onely say, you doe not desire mee, &c. I should then think my selfe obliged to burn that first part of my last answer : but as yet, wanting your directions, I have not done it.

The end.

0.

d.

100

1151